THE

GOOD Old WAY Defended,

Againſt the Attempts of *A. M.* D. D.
in his BOOK Called,

An *Enquiry* into the New *Opinions*, (Chiefly) propogated by the *Presbyterians* of

SCOTLAND:

Wherein the Divine Right of the Government of the Church by *Presbyters* Acting in Parity, is Aſſerted; and the pretended Divine Right of the Hierarchie is diſproved: the Antiquity of Parity and Novelty of Epiſcopacy as now Pleaded for, are made Manifeſt from Scriptural Arguments, and the Teſtimony of the Antient Writers of the Chriſtian-Church: and the groundleſs and unreaſonable Confidence of ſome Prelatick Writers expoſed. Alſo, the Debates about *Holy-Days*, *Schiſm*, the Church-Government uſed among the Firſt *Scots* Chriſtians, and what elſe the Enquirer Chargeth us with, are clearly Stated, and the Truth in all theſe Maintained againſt him.

Likewiſe, ſome *Animadverſions* on a Book called the *Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*; in ſo far as it miſrepreſenteth the Principles and Way of our Firſt *Reformers* from *Popery*: where the Controverſie about *Superintendents* is fully handled: and the Neceſſity which led our *Anceſtors* into that Courſe for that Time is Diſcourſed.

By *GILBERT RULE*, one of the Miniſters of the City, and Principal of the College of *EDINBURGH*.

EDINBURGH, Printed by the Heirs and Succeſſors of *Andrew Anderſon*, Printer to the King's moſt Excellent Majeſty, *Anno DOM.* 1697.

( )

To the Right Honourable,

PATRICK,

EARL of MARCHMOUNT, *Viſcount of* BLASONBERRY, *LORD* POLWARTH, of *POLWARTH*, REDBRAES, and *GREENLAW*, &c.

LORD High CHANCELLOR *of the* KINGDOM *of*

SCOTLAND.

My Noble Lord,

I Have preſumed to Prefix your Lordſhips Name to this Work, hoping that your Lordſhip will count it no dishonour for the Greateſt of Men to Patronize the leaſt of the Truths of GOD: and knowing your Zealous and Pious Concerns, as for the State, ſo for the Church of CHRIST, as now E-

ſtabliſhed

ſtabliſhed in this Nation. My Deſign in this Dedication is not to *ſeek the Rul'rs Favour*: having had for many Years, the Honour to be more Regarded by your Lordſhip than ever I could deſerve: nor to Engage your Lordſhip to own our Church againſt her open and ſecret Enemies; knowing how ſteadily you have appeared for the True Intereſt of the Church, and of the Nation, *In utraque fortuna*; and how fixed your Principles are with reſpect to both. But what I aim at is, to expreſs the true Senſe I have (as I know my Brethren alſo to retain) of your Lordſhips Wiſdom, Zeal, and Fortitude, encountering the Greateſt of Hazards, and enduring the moſt grievous of Hardſhips, for that Holy Religion that ye Profeſs; and for the Liberties of your Native Countrey. The eminent Poſt your Lordſhip is now in, as it is a Token of your Princes Favour, and His Majeſties Wiſe Choiſe of a fit Inſtrument for High and difficult Work; So it is the LORD'S Reward for your hard Services; and his giving you the Opportunity to do him further Service, of another Sort: and his Trying you whether ye will Eye GOD'S Glory above all things (when ye have the Occaſion, and Temptation of ſeeking your own Things) as ye did when ye Ventured, and loſt your All in this World for him. GOD expecteth that ye will now Pay your Vows made in your Trouble; and that ye will be ſingly, and actively for him: the Time is ſhort wherein we can Walk or Work, and Occaſions are uncertain. There will be great Peace in Reflection (when our Work is at an end) on ſincere Endeavours, and Application of Mind, to the Work that the LORD hath put in our hand. That the LORD may long Preſerve your Lordſhip, and continue your Capacity to do Him Service, and that he may Bleſs your Noble Family with His beſt Bleſſings, is the earneſt prayer of,

My Noble Lord,

Edinburgh, December 20, 1697.

Your Lordſhips Devoted and moſt Humble Servant, G. R.

TO THE READER.

THat I again appear publickly in this Paper War, (being, for my Age Miles emeritus) needeth no other Apology than the Neceſſity that the Mouths that were ſo Widely Opened againſt the Truth, and right Ways of GOD, ſhould be Stopped: and I knew of no other Endeavours this Way, when I entered on this Work, nor till I had finiſhed it. After it was in the Preſs, and ſome Progreſs made in it, I read the Learned and Induſtrious Mr. William Jameſons *Nazianzeni Quærela, & Votum Juſtum*; wherein the ſame two Authors that I Deal with, are ſolidly Refuted, and the main Subject that I Treat off, is Handled: which made me think that Book might Superſede mine. Yet the Advice of others Wiſer than my ſelf, and my own ſecond Thoughts, finding fewer Coincidences in them than might have been Expected: And that the one Work is more Hiſtorical, the other more Argumentative; ſo that they may make up a complete Anſwer to what our Adverſaries have now thought fit to ſay; and Conſidering that ſome Debates are here inſiſted on which he hath not touched: and that two Witneſſes are better than one: theſe Conſiderations (I ſay) determined me not to ſtop the Preſs, And indeed, the Unaccountable Confidence of theſe Authors, on the ſlendereſt Grounds, ſhould be expoſed as much as may be: while they Build ſo Important Truths and Practices (and preſs them ſo warmly) on Phraſes, Words, and Modes of Speaking uſed by the Ancients, which ſignified quite another thing then, than what now they are commonly applyed to. The Learned Clericus, *in his Preface to* Ars Critica, *Sect.* 3. *at the end*, hath

hath these Words here very appositе. Quot & quanti viri credidерunt se Historiam Christianarum Ecclesiarum, & Opiniones eorum qui S. S. Patres vocantur, in numerato habere, qui revera Hospites ea in re fuerunt? nempe, Vocabula nuda didicerant, aut Voces, quibus ex Hodiernis placitis Significationes tribuebant. *If we lay such Weight on Ways of Speaking of old used, as sufficient Arguments for* Prelacy, *it is reasonable to allow the same with Respect to* Popery: *And in that Case,* Thou art Peter, *and* on this Rock will I Build my Church: *and,* I will give to thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, *&c. shall infer the Popes Supremacy with as good Reason, as the Fathers Ascribing Jurisdiction to the Bishop, without mentioning the* Presbyters *at the same time, doth infer his sole Power: seing, as our Lord in another Place, giveth the same Power to the rest of the Apostles, that here He seemeth to give to* Peter *alone; so do the Fathers often speak of the Ruling Power of Presbyters, as well as they several times mention that of Bishops, without mentioning* Presbyters. *No Protestant will admit the Consequence in the one Case; wherefore neither ought we so to Argue in the other Case.*

ERRATA

E R R A T A.

PAge 1. *line* 16. *read* Principle. *p.* 5. *l.* 25. *r.* Theorems. *p.* 50. *l.* 5. *r. James. p.* 136. *l.* 8. *r.* Matters of Fact. *p.* 146. *l.* 7. *r.* Præſes. *p.* 150. *l.* 36. *r.* them. *p.* 181. *l.* 37. *r.* approved. *p.* 186. *l.* 37. *r.* great. *p.* 194. *l.* 11. *r.* Struggling. *p.* 198. *l.* 38. *r.* Rank. *p.* 199. *l.* 2. *r.* the. *p.* 204. *l.* 15. *r. Andabatarum. p.* 207. *l.* 2. *r.* injoyn. *p.* 242. *l.* 36. *r.* Holy. *p.* 247. *l.* 1. *r.* Congregations. *p.* 247. *l.* 26. *r.* Religious. *p.* 257. *l.* 16. *r.* ſound. *p.* 279. *l.* 33. *r.* Ceremony. *p.* 284. *l.* 37. *r.* Solemnities. *p.* 297. *l.* 13. *r.* acquainted. *p.* 309. *l.* 16. *r.* Things. *p.* 310. *l.* 35. *r.* Writings.

If there be any other Miſtakes of the Preſs, it is left to the Readers Candor to Correct them.

THE

THE

Good old way defended, &c.

IT hath been observed by some, who have read this Book, that the Author hath been much beholden to some of the Jesuits and other Papists, not only for his Arguments; but even for his Invectives and Reproaches cast upon his Adversaries (had he been so just as to acknowledge the true Authors of his fine Notions, there had been less blame in it) and even the imputation of *Noveltie*, of the Opinions of Presbyterians, (with which the Frontispiece of his Book is adorned) is the same Reproach that the Romanists do constantly cast on the whole of the Protestant Doctrine, which in their ordinary cant, is, *the new Gospel*. If he hath proved, or shall prove, that our Principles for Paritie, and against Prelacy, is newer than the first settling of Gospel-Churches by the Apostles; he hath some advantage against us: Yet if our way have been owned, and practised in *Scotland*, before the *Papacy*, and among the *Waldenses*, for many Ages; The edge of his prejudice against it, will be a little blunted: The former I have already debated with some of his Partie, and may have occasion to resume that Dispute, before I have done with this Book. The other may be easily made appear; For in their *Confession of Faith* (after they had fled to *Bohemia*) called *Confessio Taboritarum, Joan. Lukawitz, Waldensia* P. 23. They expresly deny, that *By Scripture warrant, Ordination is to be performed only by Bishops*; and that *Bishops have more Authority than single Priests.*

Priests. Perin. Hist. of the Vaudois, p. 53,62. (cited by *Owen of Ordination, p.* 4.) Sheweth, that *they had no other Ministers for* 500. *years, than such as was ordained by Presbyters. Walsing. Hist: of England. pag.* 339. Telleth us, that the *Lollards* (the same Sect with the *Waldenses*) *had their Ministers Ordained by Presbyters without Bishops.* Now of this Sect, even their Enemies witness that they were very Antient. *Reinerius*, an Inquisitor, in his Book *contra Hæreticos*, sayeth, that *it had continued longest of all the Sects; For some say*, (these are his Words) *they have been from the days of* Pope *Silvester.* 1. (who was in the time of the first *Nicen Council*) *others from the dayes of the Apostles.*

§ 2. It may also be made appear, that his own opinion, of the Divine Right of Prelacy is much newer than ours, not only by the Fathers (as will after appear,) but even the *Church of England*, was not of that Opinion, till *Bishop Lauds* time, and but few of them after it. *Spellman*, p 576. In the *Canons of Elfrick and Wolfin*, hath these words, *Ambo siquidem unum tenent eundem ordinem quum sit dignior illa pars Episcopi. Catal. test. verit. To.* 2. saith of *Wicklif*, *tantum duos ordines ministrorum esse debere judicavit, viz. Presbyteros & Diaconos. Fox. Act. monum. T.* 2. Among the Answers that *Lambert* the Martyr gave to the 45. Questions put to him, hath these words, *p.* 400. *As touching Priest-hood in the Primitive Church. there was no more Officers in the Church of God, than Bishops and Deacons, as witnesseth the Scripture full apertly.* He citeth also *Jerom*, for this. After the Reformation, in the Book called, *the Institution of a Christian man*, made by the whole Clergy, 1537. Authorized and injoyned by *King and Parliament*, to be preached through the whole Kingdom, it is said, *That the new Testament mentioneth but two Orders, Presbyters or Bishops, and Deacons.* Cranmers, and other Bishops Opinion I have Cited. *S.* 2. § 2. Out of a Manuscript in *Stillingfleets Ira.* In the Book called the *Bishops Book*, it is said, that *the difference between Bishops and Presbyters was a device of the ancient Fathers, not mentioned in Scripture.* For the same Opinion, *Owen of Ordination, p.* 114, 115. citeth *Jewel*, *Morton*, *Whitaker*, *Fulk*, *Nowell*, and the present *Bishop of Sarum.* § Yea,

§ 3. Yea that this our Opinion for Paritie, and againſt the Divine right of Epiſcopacy, is as old as the Reformation from Popery; is clear from the *Articuli Smalcaldici*, ſigned by *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, and many other Divines; as they are ſet down *lib. concord.* Printed *An.* 1580. *Lipſiæ art.* 10. *p* 306. Where they plead their power of ordaining their *Paſtors*, without *Biſhops*. And cite *Jerome* (aying, *Eam* (*Eccleſiam Alexandrinam*) *primum ab Epiſcopis Preſbyteris, & Miniſtris, communi operâ gubernatam fuiſſe.* Theſe articles were agreed on, *An.* 1533. After, *p.* 324, 325. They affirm of *Juriſdictio, & Poteſtas excommunicandi & abſolvendi*, that, *liquet confeſſione omnium, etiam adverſariorum noſtrorum, communem eſſe omnibus qui preſunt Eccleſiis ſive nominentur Paſtores, ſive Presbyteri, ſive Epiſcopi.* And they cite *Jerome*, as holding the ſame Opinion, and from his words obſerve, *hic docet Hieronymus diſtinctos gradus Epiſcoporum, & Presbyterorum, ſive Paſtorum, tantum humana authoritate conſtitutos eſſe: idque res ipſa loquitur, quia officium & mandatum plane idem eſt, quia autem jure divino nullum eſt diſcrimen inter Epiſcopum & Paſtorem*, &c. Theſe Articles were ſubſcribed by the Electoral Princes, *Palsegrave*, *Saxonie*, *and Brandenburg*, by 45. *Dukes*, *Marqueſſes*, *Counts*, and *Barons*, by the *Conſuls*, and *Senates* of 35. Cities, Yea, to ſhew that this Opinion was not then diſliked, even in *England*; *Bucer*, and *Fagius*, who ſubſcribed them, were brought into *England* by *Cranmer*, and employed in promoting the Reformation. The ſubſcriptions of the Noblemen mentioned, you may find at the End of the Preface of that Book.

It is, then a confidence beyond ordinary, to call the Presbyterian principle of Paritie a *new Opinion*.

§ 4. It is further to be conſidered, that as *Antiquity* is not, by it ſelf, a ſufficient Patrocinie for any Opinion; So *Noveltie* is not alwayes a juſt prejudice againſt it. If our Adverſaries plead *Antiquitie* for Prelacy, ſo may it be done for many principles which themſelves will call Errors; and this ſort of Arguments, hath in all Ages of the Church been judged invalide: It is *Divine Inſtitution*, not *humane practice*, *Cuſtome*, or *Antient Opinion*, that muſt be

a Foundation for our belief: and when they expose our way as new, they should consider, that what is Eldest in respect of its being, and Gods appointment, may be new in respect of its discovery and observation: What is old in it self, may be new to us, because, by the corruption of many Ages, it hath been hid, and at last brought forth to light again: So Christianity it self was a *Novelty* to the *Athenian* Philosophers, and by them treated with disdain and mocking, on that account; more than with rational refutation, *Acts* 17. 19, 20. *Augustins* Doctrine of Conversion, is looked on by some as what was new in that time. So was *Luthers* Doctrine, and *Calvins*, and that of the other *Reformers* in their day, *respective*. If my Antagonist can make it appear, that our Opinion about Parity, was never countenanced by Scripture, nor practised in the Christian Church, till of late in *Geneva*, or *Scotland*; Let it then pass for a *Novelty*, and on that account be condemned: but it may be more Antient than the Hierarchie; tho for many Centuries, it was not practised under the Reign, and in the Kingdom of Anti-Christ. We are very willing, according to the place of Scripture, he putteth before his Book, to ask for, and walk in the *old paths*: but these paths must be such as God of old prescribed to his People (as some expound the place, of the way that *Moses* taught them) and which they walked in, who, we are sure did not err. (as *Grotius* expoundeth this place, of the way of *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*) we know that error hath been abetted under the Notion of the old way, *Jer.* 44. 17. Neither do we think our selves obliged to follow all the paths of some Antient good men, more then the *Jews* were to do as *Aaron* did, in making the Golden Calf, tho that was a very old practice, and that Calf worshipping had been before *Jeremias* dayes, both Antient and Universal.

§ 5. Some things are to be observed in his Introduction, and first, the ill words that he very liberally, and at random, bestoweth on these who are not of his way; calling their Principles, and Writings, *Lybels*, *Spiritual Raveries* [illegible] 2. He insinuateth that we *have wickedly combined to defame them* p. 3. If p. 4. it be *not his business to complain*

complain of them, whom he ſuppoſeth, *do perſecute them*, I am ſure it ſhould leſs be his work to Rail, with ſuch unmanly, and unchriſtian revilings, at them who no other wayes oppoſe him, and his Partie, but by dint of Argument. He doth *p.* 5, 6. Suppoſe, *The Antient Miniſters of the Word to have been Biſhops with Apoſtolical Authority*, and telleth us, *How in the Primitive times, they were oppoſed, by men choſen by the People, who calculate their Doctrine, to the fancies and humours of the Multitude, and proſtituted the Goſpel to promote error, and deluſion, in ſtead of ſerving our bleſſed Saviour, they became ſlaves of the People, by whom they were originally imployed; and becauſe they were ſo unhappily ſucceſsfull, as to gratifie their luſts, they were therefore voted the moſt Edifying Teachers.* Whether this be to write a Satyre, or to plead for Truth, to the conviction of them whom he dealleth with, wiſe men will judge. It is rather to be lamented, than denyed, that there are ſuch Miniſters in the Chriſtian, yea, in the Reformed Church: but I may confidently ſay, they are not more zealouſly diſliked among any partie of men, than among the Presbyterians in *Scotland*: Whom it is evident, that by all this Diſcourſe, he deſigneth to defame; We preach againſt this Inclination, even as it is in mens hearts: and we cenſure it, when it appeareth in their practiſe, either to the promoting of Error, or diſturbing the Peace of the Church. More of this he hath, *p.* 7. of *Miniſters reconciling the moralls of the Goſpel to mens wicked practiſes, and looſer theorms, and the ſevere Diſcipline of the Antient Church to all licence and luxurie, and true faith, that worketh by love, to airie notions and miſtakes.* Whether theſe words afford us the lineaments of this mans temper, or of the Presbyterian Miniſters, I ſhall leave to others to determine. I am ſure, they who know the *Scots* Presbyterians, and do not ſpitefully hate them, will not ſay, that either their Doctrine, or their Exerciſe of Diſcipline doth tend to promote Looſneſs and Luxurie. This Author is pleaſed to repreſent them under a quite contrary Character when he findeth it for his purpoſe. Whether the Presbyterian, or

Prelatick

Prelatick Church Discipline, as they have been exercised in *Scotland*, come neareſt to the *ſevere Diſcipline of the Antient Church*, it's eaſie to determine, by them who have ſeen the one, and can judge of both, without prejudice.

§ 6. I gladly would underſtand what he meaneth by his Aſſertion, p. 6. That *the primitive Miniſters of Religion, had their immediate commiſſion from heaven, and accordingly they endeavoured to reſtore the image of God in Men*: To whom he ſetteth in oppoſition theſe ill men above mentioned. If he mean the Apoſtles, I ſhall not contradict his Aſſertion; but muſt look on it as moſt impertinent: Seing the other, who he ſaith, had their Authority from Men, were diſtinguiſhed from, and oppoſite to, not only the Apoſtles, but the ordinary faithful Miniſters of the Church, who were in, or after their dayes. Alſo the Aſſertion, ſo underſtood, could make nothing for Prelacy, or againſt Paritie, in the primitive Church, which ſeemeth to be the deſign of this Paſſage. If he underſtand it of Biſhops, who, he fancieth to have ſucceeded to the Apoſtles; this is a *new opinion*, with a Witneſs; and for any thing I know, himſelf firſt hatched it: and we ſhall allow him the honour of this new diſcovery, that Biſhops have their Immediate Commiſſion from Heaven: I know no Opinions held by Presbyterians, ſo new as this, of one who undertaketh to refute their new Opinions. Sure, if it be ſo, they muſt then ſhew their credentials from Heaven, and the ſigns of Apoſtles wrought in them. As 2 *Cor.* 12. 12. And theſe might ſuperſede the King's *Congedelire*, and their Conſecration, and alſo, all the debate that is about their Prelation, and will excuſe us from owning them, till we be ſatisfied in this matter, wherein we promiſe not to be unreaſonably incredulous.

§ 7. He proceedeth in his Reproaches, and unaccountable Extravagancy; while p. 7. He ſpeaketh of the *ſhaking of the foundations of Eccleſiaſtical Unitie*, (as if Unity were only found in the Prelatical way) and *trampling on Antient Conſtitutions with great Inſolence, and Impiety*. Suppoſing (without any ſemblance of Proof) that then the hedge of true Religion is not only invaded

but

but demoliſhed, when Epiſcopacy is laid aſide, and that *without theſe ſacred Vehicles* (*viz.* The Antient Conſtitutions about Prelacy,) *true Religion muſt evaporate into giddineſs and Enthuſiaſm.* If this wild talk be not *ſpiritual raverie*, (to uſe his own words) I know not what can be called by that Name. It is of the ſame ſtrain, that *the extravagance of theſe laſt dayes*, (which is wholly charged on Presbytery) *is boundleſs, and Sceptical, and Chriſtianity is more dangerouſly wounded, by the deluſions of ſome that are Baptized* (Preſbyterians) *then by the open blaſphemies of Infidels*; and that *the firſt* (*viz.* the Presbyterians) *are altogether inacceſſible by reaſon*, that *they pretend to extraordinary illuminations, and will not be inſtructed, their Errors are made ſtronger by their vanity.* And much more is falſly and injuriouſly ſaid to this purpoſe. To which I have no other Reply, but the words of *Pſalms* 12. 3, 4. *The Lord ſhall cut off all flattering lips, and the tongue that ſpeaketh proud things, who have ſaid, with our tongue will we prevail, our lips are our own, who is Lord over us*, and Pſal. 120. 3, 4. *What ſhall be given unto thee, or what ſhall be done unto thee, O falſe tongue.* We can anſwer his Arguments, and are willing to be Inſtructed by him, and attacked that way: But who can ſtand before this kind of Topicks? I have not met with any Perſon who is of opinion that Presbyterians *think to make their Calling and Election ſure, only by Diviſion and Singularitie*, ſave this Author. *p.* 8. Who ſeemeth to take the ſame Liberty to himſelf, of ſpeaking all the ill he can deviſe of Presbyterians, that the Author of *pax vobis* doth againſt Proteſtants of all ſorts. I am not at leaſure to enquire how much he hath borrowed from that Author; But it is evident that the ſtrain of both is the ſame: I ſhall take little notice of his confident inſinuation. *p.* 9. That *Prelacy was revealed by our Saviour, taught by his Apoſtles, and received by all Churches in the firſt and beſt Ages*: For the truth of this is to be tryed in the following Debate; But I cannot overlook his ſuppoſing, that *we reject certain Rituells and practiſes, which by the plaineſt and moſt undenyable conſequences are agreeable to the general Rules of Scripture, and the uniform*

Belief

Belief of all Christians: If he can prove the Contraverted Ceremonies to be such, we shall correct our Opinion about them.

§ 8. He layeth some Foundations, *p.* 10. and 11. For his following Dispute, which we cannot allow, as first, that *the first Christians were agreed among themselves about not only the great Articles of Religion; but also about the General Rules of Ecclesiastick Order, and Discipline*; under which Head, he plainly includes the *Rituals of the Church*. It is to be lamented, that even in Doctrine, there was not that Unitie, that was fit, in the Primitive times: we read of many Heresies early broached: for *Order*, it was not the same among all, there were sad Schisms, as well as Heresies: and for *Ritualls*, we find no General Rule they agreed in, for Ordering them, save the Word of GOD, contained in the Scriptures. For General Councills, that medled most with these, were later than the times we speak of. And it is well known, what Fatal Contentions there were about some of them; such as the time of observing *Easter*. Yea, the first Churches had different *Ritualls*, about which they made no Divisions, but used Christian forbearance. *Socrates* hath a whole Chapter to prove this; which is, C. 21. of *lib* 5. *of hist. Ecclesi.* *Iraneus* reproving *Victor*, for Excommunicating the *Quarto Decimani*, hath these words, καὶ γὰρ οἱ τῆς αὐτῆς πίστεως ὄντες διαφερῦσι περὶ τὰ ὀθνεῖα πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς. And at large sheweth, that the Primitive Christians did not censure one another, for difference of Rites and Customs observed among them. Every one knoweth how far the Churches of the first Ages were, from uniformity in their *Fasting*; Some abstaining from that which others did not Scruple to eat: in the frequency of Communicating: about the *time and manner of Baptising*: about the *time and degrees of publick penance, placing the Altar*, or Communion Table, *&c.* It is evident then, that the first Christians did not look on *Ritualls*, as that about which Christian Concord should be judged of: They minded things of higher moment, and greater necessity.

§ 9. Another Paradox that he Advanceth is, that *by this uniformity in Doctrine and Rituals, they* (*the Primitive Christians*,) strengh-

ned

nad themſelvis againſt Infidels *and* Hereticks. This Aſſertion with reſpect to *Rituals*, is wild and abſurd; not only becauſe ſuch Uniformity was not found, nor much regarded among them, as hath been ſhewed; but alſo, becauſe this Uniformity in Matters ſo extrinſick to Religion, could afford them no ſtrength; more than an Army is the ſtronger, by all the Souldiers wearing Coats of the ſame Faſhion and Colour. It was their Unity in the Truths of God, their Managing the Ordinances of God by one Divine Rule, and their Love and forbearance of one another, in the different Practice of ſuch *Rituals* as were not Inſtituted by Chriſt, in theſe as the Means, did their ſtrength ly. Yet another ſtrange Poſition; he ſuppoſeth the Conſtitutions wherein he and we differ *to have been received among all Chriſtians*, (which never hath yet been proved) and affirmeth, that *deſpiſing theſe overthroweth the Foundations of Peace and Charity; and conſequently, we exclude our ſelves from the viſible Fellowſhip of Chriſts Houſhold and Family.* His Suppoſition (which *p.* 11. and often elſe where, he confidently layeth as a Foundation of his whole Debate) is groundleſs; as I hope, will appear in the Progreſs of this Diſquiſition. His Aſſertion is falſe and dangerous. For 1. There was Peace amongſt the primitive Churches, where ſeveral of the Conſtitutions he talketh of, were practiſed by ſome, and neglected or deſpiſed by others; as may be Inſtanced in the *Trina Immerſio*, and many others. 2. Even about ſome Truths and Ordinances of God, there were Debates in the primitive Churches, and ſome differed from that which was generally held, and yet they were not Excommunicated, but dealt with by more ſoft Means, and born with, till the Lord ſhould enlighten their Mind, according to the Apoſtles direction, *Phil.* 3. 15, 16. 3. It is the way of the Antichriſtian Church, but of few others, to unchurch all Siſter Churches who differ from them in any thing, even in *Rituals*: this is not the Spirit of the Goſpel. If he underſtand that they only exclude themſelves from the Church, who differ from what all and every one hold who are Chriſtians, his Aſſertion cannot be contradicted; yet it may be Ridiculed, for that is impoſſible for any who is a Chriſtian, to do: but if he ſpeak of what is commonly received, this very Aſſertion doth Sap the Foundation of all Peace and Unity in the Church: that all they were to be Treated as Apoſtats from the Church and Chriſtianity, who have a ſingular Sentiment about any one Point of Doctrine, or Ceremony, even though they Diſſent never ſo modeſtly: and this will Authorize all the Severi-

ties of the *Inquisition*. Whether will mens furious Zeal for Humane Devices carry them?

§ 10. What followeth, doth surmount all that we have heard. p. 11. *Whatever is uniformly determined by the wisest and best of Christians, (their learnedst Bishops and Presbyters) must be received as the infallible Truth of God; else we have no certain Standard to distinguish the Catholick Church in former Ages, from the Combinations of* Hereticks. And a little below, *The uniform Voice of Christendom in the first and purest Ages, is the best Key to the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles and their Successors.* I make here two Obserues, before I consider the thing that is thus boldly Asserted. The former is, that (may be through oversight) he giveth Presbyters a share in Determining, or decisive Power about what must be received as the infallible Truth of God, together with the Bishops: *Ergo*, Bishops have not the sole Authority in the Church; but of this afterward. The other is, it is manifest that he here speaketh not of the Apostles, but of the ordinary and fixed Ministers of the Church, who taught and ruled the Church after the decease of the Apostles, and after the Canon of Scripture was finished. Now this Position containeth things worthy of our Observation. First, that this learned Author maintaineth an Infallibility to be in the Guides of the Church, so as they cannot erre; seeing what they Determine must be received as the Infallible Truth of God. 2. That there must be an Infallible Judge of Controversies in the Church, beside the Scripture; and without this, we have no Standard of Truth, but must wander in the dark, the Scripture being unfit and insufficient to guide us in the way of Truth, and to discover Heresie to us. 3. That this infallible Judge of Controversies, is the Bishops and Presbyters agreeing together, and uniformly Determining what is Truth. But here our Author leaveth us at a loss: What if some of these Bishops and Presbyters who meet to frame our Articles of Faith, or Canons for our Practice, be none of the Wisest, Best, nor Learnedst, yet have made a shift to get into the Office of Bishop or Presbyter? Next, what if his wisest and best Christians, that is, the learnedst Bishops and Presbyters, do not Determine uniformly about our Faith, or what concerneth our Practice; but some few Dissent, or are not clear to go along with the rest? Whether in that case, have we any Standard for our Religion? He would do well to give us Light in this, when he hath better digested his Notions, and writeth his second thoughts on this Head. If some other Person had written at this rate, we should quickly have had

had a whole Book, or a long Preface to one, expoſing his *Ignorance*, *Impudence*, and other ſuch qualities: but I ſhall impute no more to this learned Doctor, but that he hath not well Conſidered what he here ſaith.

§ 11. It may be it will have little weight with him, if I affirm and make it appear, that this is plainly and directly the Doctrine of the *Roman Church*; yea, their darling Principle: and indeed the Foundation on which that Church is built; and without believing of which, they affirm that we have no certainty for our Religion: even as this Author thinketh, we have no Standard to diſtinguiſh the *Catholicks* from *Hereticks*. That this is their Doctrine, I might prove by whole Shoals of Citations; I ſhall ſingle out a few. *Eccius, Enchirid. de conciliis. Tollatur Patrum & Conciliorum authoritas, omnia in Eccleſia erunt ambigua, dubia, pendentia, incerta.* Melthior Canus, loc: Com: 7. C: 3. concluſ: 5. *In expoſitione ſacrarum Literarum, communis omnium ſanctorum Patrum intelligentia certiſſimum Argumentum Theologo præſtant, ad Theologicas Aſſertiones corroborandas; quippe Sanctorum omnium ſenſus Spiritus ſancti ſenſus ipſi ſit. Quanquam à Philoſophis quidem rationem Philoſophicæ concluſionis jure forſitan poſtulare, in ſacrarum autem literarum intelligentia, majoribus noſtris debes, nulla etiam ratione habita, credere, & quas ſententias de lege, de fide, de Religione ab illis accipiſti defendere.* Greg: de valent: Analyſ: fidei, lib: 8: c. 9. *Quod Patres unanimi conſenſu circa Religionem tradunt, infallibiliter verum eſt.* Bellarm: lib. 2. de Chriſto, cap. 2: & lib. 1: de Purgatorio, cap. 10. *Patres nunquam omnes ſimul errant, etiamſi aliquis eorum interdum erret, nam ſimul omnes in uno errore convenire non poſſunt.* Here is a ſweet Harmony, between our Authors aſſertion, and the Doctrine of theſe learned men, from whom it ſeems he hath borrowed it. But becauſe (as I ſaid) perhaps he will not be aſhamed to own this, I ſhall bring an Argument or two, againſt theſe Principles that he aſſerteth, or are by juſt conſequences, drawn out of his words: referring the Reader for full ſatisfaction, to the learned Proteſtant Writers (whether Epiſcopal or Presbyterian) who have defended the Reformation againſt the Papiſts; for I am ſure, many even of the Prelatical Party, differ from him in this Principle.

§ 12. For the 1. That there is not Infallibility in all Points of Faith or Practice, to be found among the Guides of the Church after the Apoſtles; but that any of them, yea all of them, may in ſome of theſe Points, erre: I prove 1. No ſuch Infallibility is promiſed to any, or all of the Guides of the Church, *tu es Petrus*: *lo am I with you*: and ſuch like

like Promises, cannot bear the Weight of our Authors Opinion; for the Church may be safe from the gates of Hell, and may have Christs presence, even though her Guides be under some Mistakes in lesser Matters. 2. This Infallibility is inconsistent with Experience: the Guides of the *Jewish* Church erred foully, when they condemned our Lord as a Deceiver: and yet that Church had the Promise of Gods Teaching, Upholding, and Presence, which was fulfilled upon the Remnant of true Believers that were among them. The *Arian* Church, and the *Popish* Church, have foully erred, and yet both of them did overspread the face of Christianity almost wholly; but there was still a Remnant according to the Promise. 3. The Fathers (whom I suppose he meaneth by his wise, good, and learned Bishops and Presbyters) not only did each of them erre in some things, (which I hope he will not deny, and how then shall Infallibility in all things, be found among them joyntly?) but they disown this Infallibility to be in themselves, or in others, as is clear from several Testimonies which I have cited to this purpose; Pref. to *Cyprianic Bishop examined, p.* 2. To which I now add *Clem. Alexand. Strom. lib.* 7. *sub finem*: ἔχομεν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν τὸν διδάσκαλον, *&c. we have the Lord for the Principle of our Doctrine, who hath taught us by the Prophets and by the Apostles. If any man thinks this Principle needs another Principle, he doth not truly keep that Principle.* And a little after, οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν *&c. We do not rest on the Testimony of men, but we believe* (concerning what is in Debate) *the voice of the Lord*: and a little before he telleth us, that *we do not believe the Assertions of men, they must not only say, but prove; and that from the Scriptures.* Basil. Regula moralium 72. τῶν ἀκροωμένων *&c. The Hearers who are Instructed in the Scriptures, must examine the Doctrine of their Teachers, they must receive these things which are agreeable to Scripture, and reject these that are contrary to it.* Cyp. Ep. 63. ad Cæcilium. *Quod solus Christus debet audiri &c. that Christ alone should be heard, the Father witnesseth from Heaven. Non ergo attendere debemus, &c. We must not then consider what others before us have thought should be done; but what Christ did, who is before all: for we must not follow the Custome of men, but the Truth of God.* Chrisost. Homil. 13. in 2 Cor. sub finem. μετὰ τὰς τῶν πολλῶν δόξας *&c: Let us not carry about the Opinion of the Multitude, but try things: we have the Scripture, the exact Standard* (ξύγον) *the Index* (γνώμων) *and the Rule* (κανὼν) *leaving what this or that man thinketh about these things, enquire of all these things from the Scripture.* Here is another Standard than what our

our Author mentioneth. *Origen. Homil. in Jerom. It is necessary that we call in the Testimony of the Holy Scriptures; for our Opinions and Discourses makes no Faith, without these Witnesses.* Cyril. Catehes. 4. μηδὲ ἐμοὶ &c. *Do not believe me saying these things, unless I have them out of the Scriptures. Ambros. lib. 1. de fide. ad Gratianum. Nolo Argumento nostro credas, &c. I would not ye should believe our Reasoning; let us ask the Scriptures, the Prophets, the Apostles; let us ask Christ.*

§ 13. To say that all this is to be understood, of what one or a few Fathers say, not of that wherein they all agree: This hath various absurdities in it; for 1. It is falsly supposed (as in the Progress of the Debate will appear) that the Fathers are agreed about the Prelacy our Author contendeth for. 2. If every one of them may erre, why may they not all erre, seeing the Collective Body of them is made up only of infallible men? Christs promise of being in the midst of two or three gathered together in his Name, doth not free them from all Mistakes. The Fathers together, and the same men apart, are the same persons under different Notions; and therefore they cannot be both fallible and infallible. 3. The Testimonies above brought, do not only make single Fathers fallible, but whatever Combinations of them ye can imagine; for they are still men, and the Fathers above cited, make infallibility to be peculiar to Christ speaking in his Word. *Augustine* doth often and plainly bar this Distinction: *contra Faustum, lib. 11. c. 5. id genus, &c. We must read that kind of Writing, not with necessity of Believing, but with liberty of Judging.* And *Ep: 112: ad Paulinam. Quod Divinarum Scripturarum, &c. That which is confirmed by the Authority of the Holy Scriptures, is without doubt, to be believed;* but for other Witnesses or Testimonies (whether single or Combined, he maketh no difference as to this) ye may receive or reject them, as ye shall judge they have more or less weight. Also, Tom. 2: *Ep: 19: Solus Scripturarum libris, &c. I have learned to give this honour and reverence to the Books of Scripture only, to believe there is no errour in them: but I read others, however learned or Godly they be,* (see how exactly he meeteth with our Authors notion, of ascribing Infallibility to what is Determined by the most Wise, learned and Godly Bishops and Presbyters) *I so read them, that I do not believe any thing to be true because they thought so; but because they prove it by the Scriptures, that it is so.* This forced a Confession from *Occam* (a Papist of profound Learning, a Disciple of our Country man *Joannes Dans*) that *Augustine* here maketh no difference amongst other Writers, beside the Prophets

and

and Apostles; whether they be Popes or others; whether they write in Council or out of it. I shall refer the Reader to the Protestant Writers, who have collected the Errours and Mistakes even of General, and also more private Councils.

§. 14. The second Proposition that may be drawn out of this Authors words, is, that an infallible Judge of Truth and Errour is necessary in the Church, besides the Scripture; for he telleth us, that *without the uniform Determination of Truth, by the wisest, best and learnedst Bishops and Presbyters*, we have no Standard whereby to *judge of the* Catholick Church, *from the Combination of* Hereticks: this Principle falleth with the former; for if there be no Infallibility but in the Scripture, such a Judge cannot be necessary: for the Church doth *de facto*, subsist without such a Judge. Again, the chief ground on which his Partizans the Papists, assert the necessity of such a Judge, is, because the Scripture cannot hear Parties, nor can it pronounce a Sentence which the contending Parties may hear, and be obliged by: I ask him, if his *wisest, best, and most learned Bishops and Presbyters*, can hear him and me, and audibly pronounce a Sentence for either of us, they being now all dead, as well as the Apostles and Prophets, and nothing of them extant but their Writings, as are also the Sacred Writings? The one is not a visible Judge more than the other; and if we Appeal to the Writings of the Fathers, why not rather to the Scripture it self, which I have proved to be of more, yea, of the only infallible Authority. And indeed, there can be no visible Judge but the present Church, to which therefore the Papists flee. And even that cannot be such a Judge to all Christians; for they cannot all hear the Pope, or Council, pronouncing a Sentence, and therefore must be content with their Writings, or Report of their Priests, who pretend to no Infallibility: and it is strange, that more certainty should be expected from either of these, than from the Divinely Inspired Scriptures. A visible Judge we own, to wit, the Guides of the Church lawfully conveened: an infallible Judge we also acknowledge; *viz.* God speaking in his Word: but a Judge that is both infallible, and also now visible to us, we cannot find. The Protestants Arguments against this Popish Errour I shall not insist on; they are, 1. That the Spirit of God in Scripture, sendeth us not to men, but to the written Word of God, for Decision in controverted, or doubtful Points, *Isa.* 8: 20: *Luk.* 27: 29: *Mat.* 22: 29: *John* 5: 39. 2. Christ and his Apostles, did always appeal to Scripture, and to no other Judge, 3. All men may erre, as hath been

head shewed; and therefore they cannot be an infallible Judge. 4. If there were such a Judge, sure the Lord would have told us who he is, and that there is such a one: but not one word of either of these in the Bible. 5. Neither the Papists, nor such as this Author, can tell us where we shall find this infallible Judge: they are not agreed whether the Pope alone, or a general Council alone, or both concurring, must be this Judge. He telleth us of the *wisest, best, and most learned Bishops and Presbyters*, but leaveth us to guess who these were: it is a hard case, if our certainty of Faith must hang upon this Pin, who were *the best, the wisest, and most learned* among them who have Instructed the Church. The third Proposition above mentioned, cannot stand, the other two being taken away: it hath been made appear, that Scripture is the only Standard; and therefore not the learned and wise Bishops. Also that they have disowned such Infallibility and Authority to be in themselves or any men; *Et collapsa ruunt subductis tecta columnis.*

SECTION II.

The Question stated.

THE first of the *New Opinions* with which this Author is pleased to charge Presbyterians, is that *they are for the Government of the Church by Presbyters acting in Parity, and against Prelacy, or the Jurisdiction of a Bishop over Presbyters.* He is pleased to examine some of our Arguments, and pretendeth to answer them, *c.* 1, 2: and then cometh to prove his Opinion, *c.* 3. Thus stating the Question *p.* 105, *whether the Rectoral Power, and Episcopal Jurisdiction that the Apostles had over subordinat Ecclesiasticks, was afterward committed to, and exercised by particular persons, or to a Colledge of Presbyters acting in perfect Parity and Equality.* I do not fancy this Method, that a Dispute should be so copiously insisted on, and Arguments so much tossed for the one side, before we come to state the Question, and determine what we controvert about. Wherefore, though I intend to leave nothing in his Book untouched that is material, I shall use another Method. 1. I shall state the Question. 2. Bring more and plainer Arguments for our Opinion, besides these which he is pleased to take notice of. 3. Reinforce these our Arguments which he meddleth with. 4. Consider the strength of his Plea for Bishops, on account of their Succession to the Apostles.

§ 2. In

§ 2. In order to stating the Question, we are to consider, that there are different Sentiments about the Government of the Church, even among the Episcopal Party themselves, who talk so highly of Unity, and condemn others who differ from them, (I mean the Presbyterians) as Schismaticks; and such in whose Communion people may not safely abide, as this Author doth more than insinuat, *p:* 11. The various Opinions of our prelatical Brethren, I have taken notice of *Rational def: of Nonconform: p:* 159, 160, 161. I shall not resume what is there discoursed; but consider this Diversity somewhat more extensively. Some think that no one form of Government is held forth in Scripture, or was practised in the Apostolick Churches: I have seen this question learnedly Debated in a *Manuscript*; if the Abetters of it mean, that sometimes the Apostles acted by their own sole Authority; at other times they left the Management to the ordinary fixed Officers in the Church; and on other Occasions, deputed Evangelists to Govern for them, for a time; or that in some Circumstances of Government, they did not always observe Uniformity: I think all this may be allowed; but if it be meant, that the Substantials of Government were not always the same, as acted by the ordinarie fixed Officers; but that some Churches were then Governed by Bishops, others by a Colledge of Presbyters: I see no ground for such a Debate, nor to think that there was any such Variety in the Apostostolick Church. 2. *I* have some where found it denyed, that Apostles had Majority of Power or Jurisdiction over Presbyters: and *Paul Bayn, dioces: Tryal, p:* 73: *Arg:* 5: *and p:* 77. *Conclus:* 5. is cited for this Also Mr. *Rutherf: Div: Right of Church Government, p:* 21. *I* need not Debate this. And *I* find *Bayn* saith no more, but that the Apostles had not Majoritie of Directive or Corrective Power as Lords, but only as Christs Ministers; and that no such Power is in the Church, save in the Person of Christ: but he expresly alloweth in them Ministerial Power, declarative and authoritative. Mr. *Rutherf: I* suppose, meaneth no more. This indeed is the Opinion of many, and our Adversaries cannot disprove it, that the Apostles did not usually make use of their Power in settled Churches, further than to declare the Mind of Christ to them; but left the exercise of Church Power to the settled Officers of these Churches. 3. Some are of Opinion, that though the Apostles exercised Authority in Governing the Churches, and left Ecclesiastical Officers in the possession of it, to be exercised by them, during the want of the Christian Magistrat: yet as soon as the Church had

lead a Civil Magistrat owning the Faith, that all ruling Power devolved into his hand. This is no part of our present Debate; though our Brethren in the late Reigns, allowed much more of the Exercise of Church power to the Magistrate, than was warrantable. 4. We debate not now about the Popes Monarchical power over the whole Christian Church, though many think that Monarchical power of Bishops, over the Presbyters and People of a large District, now called a Diocess, hath no more Warrand in Scripture, than this hath. Nor 5. Do we now debate whether the Government of the Church be Democratical, and to be managed by the body of the people: or so Aristocratical, as to be managed by the Elders in every single Congregation, independent on superior Judicatures, to whom no Appeal may be from them, or who may call them to an account for their actings, and authoritatively Censure them. 6. Some hold that no one Form of Church Government is now necessary, or of Divine right, but that the Church or Magistrat in several Churches, may Appoint what shall be found most fit and suitable to the people among whom it is to be exercised. This Opinion was lately generally owned by our Episcopalians, and asserted strongly by Doctor *Stillingfleet*, now Bishop of *Worcester*: (that learned Author doth also prove, out of an antient *Manuscript*, that this was the Opinion of *Cranmer*, and four other Bishops) and it met with no Opposition from that Party, so far as we could hear of; nay, not by this our Author who is now so highly become a *Jure Divino* man. It was then the way to Preferment, and suteable to the *Oath of Supremacy*, and more especially to the *Test*. But it is one thing with some men, to think that a Popish King may alter Church Government: and another thing to allow the same Power to a Protestant King. We are then agreed about the *Jus Divinum* of a *species* of Church Government, and the unalterableness of it: which maketh it seem strange, that this learned Author should make such Tragical Outcrys against our pleading a Divine Right, as if this were *Enthusiasm*, yea, *much worse than speculative Enthusiasm*, p. 14: *Visions and fancies*, ibid: while he is as positive for the Divine Right of what he holdeth: which we shall not call by so ill names; but think, that who hath the worse in matter of Argument, is in an Errour; but such an Errour as is consistent with Sobriety, and good sense.

§ 3. The Question is not 7. What sort of Church Government is best, and nearest to the Scripture Pattern? for that may be nearer to

it, which yet doth deviate from the Scripture, but less than another Form of Government doth: and though that Form of Government is more commendable, than another which cometh neareſt to the Pattern in all the Steps of the Adminiſtration of it; and we are willing that parity and prelacy be thus compared in all that they can charge us with, or we can charge on them; (which Compariſon I cannot now ſtay to make in the Particulars in which it may be ſtated) yet they contend that Prelacy is exactly what Chriſt willeth to be exerciſed in the Church: and we ſay the ſame of Parity: and herein lyeth the Queſtion. 8. It is to be noted that our Controverſie is not about the name, but the power of a Biſhop. The Paſtors of the Church are called Biſhops, Act. 20. 28. 1 Tim. 3. 1. and elſe where: for the power of a Biſhop, (as this name is appropriated to one Presbyter.) We deny not that very early in the primitive Church, the *Praeſes* in their Meeting for Diſcipline and Government was fixed, and had that place during life, and due management of his Office: and he had a power of calling and ordering their Meetings, and was ſubject to their Cenſures. But our Brethren are not content with this; but affirm, that by Divine Inſtitution, and primitive Practice, the Biſhop had a majority of power both extenſively, that is over the Paſtors and people, which other Presbyters had not: and that over the Paſtors and people of many Congregations, which we call a Dioceſs: and alſo intenſive, that is, that he hath power in ſome things wherein the other Presbyters have no ſuch power: for they reſerve to him the ſole power of Ordination and Juriſdiction. It is true, ſome of them ſhun the word of ſole power, and call it but a Majority of power: which is but to cover the nakedneſs of their Opinion, and inconſiſtent with their own practice: for they will not ſay that the Presbyter is aſſumed by the Biſhop *in plenitudinem poteſtatis*, but only *in partem ſollicitudinis*: they make the Presbyters ſubject to the Biſhop as a Rector, and as a Judge, in that they can do no act of power without his allowance: and he by himſelf may cenſure them, and cannot be cenſured by them, even in their collective Capacity: yea, they maintain that it is of the Biſhops good will, not neceſſitie, or obligation, that he taketh the advice of the Presbyters in any act of Government: that he is the only Paſtor of the Dioceſs, and all the reſt of the Clergy are his Curats. It is true, ſome are more modeſt in expreſſing their Sentiments in this matter,; but theſe things are held by many *in terminis*, and particularly all this muſt be owned by this Author, (though he giveth us no diſtinct

accounts

account of his Principles) being he maketh Bishops Successors to the Apostles in their governing the Church, and that in their Rectoral Power, which he describes p. 97. *to Preach, Govern the Church, give Rules and Directions to their Successors and to all subordinate Ecclesiasticks, to inflict Censures*, &c. This power Apostolical, he contendeth to have been communicated unto the Bishops, and not to all the Presbyters. J. S. in his *Principles of the Cyprianick age*, talketh high of this Power of *the Bishops Majesty, Monarchy, singular Prerogatives*, which I have else where examined.

§ 4. It is to be considered, 9. That there are diverse Opinions amongst the Episcopalians, who ascribe this power to the Bishop, about the Foundation of it, or how he cometh by it: some of them say, that Christ while he was on Earth, Instituted this Authority in the persons of Bishops, and made this difference between them and Presbyters. This the Bishop of *Worcester* denyeth, while *Iren.* p. 197. he saith, that Christ gave equal power for ruling the Church, *in actu primo*, to all Ministers of the Gospel: others make it to be of Apostolick Institution; affirming that the Apostles after Christs Ascension, did appoint it. About this we contend not; but acknowledge it to be of Divine Right and unalterable, if either of these can be proved: for what the Apostles did in settling Church Order, was by the infallible Guidance of the Spirit of God. Others again hold, that this power was not settled till after the Apostles time: and that it was brought in by Custome, which obtained in process of time, and by degrees: but being of such reverend Antiquity, and practised by the Fathers, and all the primitive Churches, it may not be altered. There are also among them who say, it is only *Juris Ecclesiastici*, and was settled by the Church, and may be by her Authority changed. Our Opinion is, It hath none of these Foundations: that it was never settled by Christ, nor his Apostles; but that they settled the Government of the Churches, by Presbyters acting in parity: nor gave power to the Church, or any man, or men, to alter this Constitution: and so that this Power is usurped and unlawful.

§ 5. Out of what hath been discoursed, our present Controversie turneth on this Hinge: whether the Government of the Church, which by Divine appointment is to be used in all the ages and parts of the Christian Church, should be by one Prelate, managing it by his sole Authority, and the counsel of Presbyters, so far as he thinketh fit to ask or take it: or by the Presbyters of the Church in their several Classes or Combi-

nations, acting with parity of power: the former part of the Question my Antagonist pleadeth for: I stand for the latter part of it; to wit, that our Debate is not about the Accidentals or Circumstantials of Church Government; nor about what is practised by this or that Party, (for no doubt there are many things on both sides that want to be reformed, and which we can pretend no Divine right for) but it is about the Essentials of it, Prelacy or Parity.

§ 6. Before I proceed to the Arguments *pro* or *con*, I shall briefly examine what my Antagonist is pleased to premise to his examining of our Arguments: which may possibly clear our way in some things to be after debated. I first notice an expression he uses in representing our Opinion; that we hold, that *in all Meetings of the Church, Presbyters act in perfect parity*: so *p.* 12. I hope he will suffer us to explain the meaning of that Expression, (if any have used it, which I do not remember) we pretend not to such a parity as excludeth the ordinary power of a temporary Moderator, as hath been above expressed: neither to exclude the majority of Power that preaching Presbyters have above them that are only ruling; nor of both above Deacons: nor do we by perfect parity, exclude that Influence that one by his Reason, may have on others who are not so well gifted. Wherefore, we own a perfect parity, in no other sense, but that preaching Presbyters are of the same order with a Bishop; and that he cannot act in matters of Government, without their concurrence, more than any of them can act without him. 2. I take notice that *p.* 22. he saith that *such a Doctrine* (the Divine right of parity) *must be of dangerous consequence; because it is altogether new.* What is to be thought of its *novelty*, I have shewed *Sect.* 1 § 1, and 2. As also, how weak the consequence is from its *novelty* (such as I have acknowledged) to its being false. The dangerous consequence of it is, in general asserted; but he hath not told what hazard, in particular, ariseth to the Church from this way of Government: many think that the greatest and most essential concernments of Religion, have been more promoted under Parity, than under Prelacy: If he will prove his Assertion, making the contrary appear, we shall consider the strength of his Reasons.

§ 7. He asserteth, that *our Opinion is not only different from the uniform Testimony of Antiquity*, (which we deny, and shall consider his proofs in the subsequent Debate) *but also the first Presbyterians among our selves; who declare, in their* Confession of Faith, *that all Church Policy is variable:*

so

so far we shall from asserting that indefensible Divine and unalterable Right of Bishops. He addeth, that *they only pretended that it was allowable*; and more to this purpose. Let me a little examine this confident Assertion of matter of Fact. I suppose by the *Confession of Faith* of the first Presbyterians, he meaneth that Summ of Doctrine which they appointed to be drawn up 1560. as that Doctrine that the Protestants would maintain: there, Article 24. are these words: *Not that we think any Policy, and an order of Ceremonies can be appointed for all Ages, times, and places: for as Ceremonies, such as men have devised, are but temporary; so may and ought they to be changed, when they rather foster Superstition, than edifie the Church using the same.* Here is not a word of Church Government; neither can these words rationally be understood of Ceremonies in a strick sense, as contradistinguished from Civil Rites and natural Circumstances in religious actings: for Ceremonies peculiar to Religion, the reforming Protestants of *Scotland* never owned, but such as were of Divine Institution. But that they did not hold the Government of the Church, by Prelacy or Parity, to be indifferent, is evident, in that in *the Book of Policy*, or *the Book of Discipline*, they do own only *four sorts of ordinary and perpetual Office bearers in the Church*: *to wit*, *Pastors*, *Doctors*, *Elders*, *and Deacons*, where the Bishop is plainly excluded: nor did they ever look on *Superintendents* as perpetual Officers; but for the present necessity of the Church, not yet constituted. It is like this Debate may again occur: wherefore I now insist no further on it.

§ 8. He blindly throweth Darts at Presbyterians, which sometimes miss them, and wound his own party: as p. 12, he hath this Assertion, *when a Society of men set up for Divine, absolute, and infallible Rights, they ought to bring plain proofs for what they say; else they must needs be looks on as Impostors, or at least self conceited and designing men*; and much to this purpose. Is it easie to subsume, but this Author and his Partizans set up for *Divine, absolute and infallible right for Prelacy*; and yet they bring not plain proofs for what they say: therefore he and they are *Impostors, self conceited and designing men*: they indeed pretend to plain proofs; and so do we: let the Reader then judge whose proofs are plainest, and best founded; and who are to be judged *Impostors*, by his Arguments. But in truth there is no consequence to a mans being an *Impostor*, from his owning a Divine Right, even though his Arguments be defective in plainness, and in strength: it only followeth that such do mistake, and understand not the mind of God in that matter, so well as they should; and

that

that their strength of Reason doth not answer the confidence of their Assertion: and if this be a Blame (as I think it is) no men in the world are more guilty than his party; nor among his party, than himself: as will appear in examining his Assertions and Arguments. For *self conceit*, the Reader will easily see where it may be observed, if he consider the supercilliousness with which his Book is written. If Presbyterians be the designing men, they are great fools: for there are no *Bishopricks*, nor *Deanries*, nor very fat Benefices to be had in that way: which might be the Objects of such designs. Who are the *head strong* men that *will knock others on the head, unless they will swear they see that which indeed they cannot see*, may be judged by the Excommunications, and the *Capias's* and consequents of these, which many of late did endure for pure Nonconformity. I am not acquainted with these Presbyterians, who say *that none but wicked men will oppose our Government*: this is none of our Doctrine: it is rather his own who excludeth from the Church such as are for Presbytery, and affirmeth it to be dangerous to continue in the communion of such: we do not Excommunicat any who differ from us about Church Government, for their Opinion, nor for not joining with us. Neither do we pronounce such a heavy Doom on the Prelatists who separate from us, as *J. S.* doth on them who separate from the Episcopal Church: *Principles of the Cyprianick Age*, p. 19. His calling our Arguments *a labyrinth of dark and intricat Consequences, obscure and perplexed Probabilities, Texts of Scripture sadly wrested and Distorted*, p. 15. This I say is a silly Artifice to foreſtal the Readers mind before he hear the Debate; which will take with few, even of his own party. We are not ashamed to produce our Arguments, for all this insolent Contempt.

SECTION III.

Some Arguments for Parity, not mentioned nor answered by the Enquirer.

IN this Enquiry our Author pretendeth to answer our Arguments: and thinketh he hath done his work when he hath taken notice of two Texts of Scripture, (which yet he confesseth that our ablest Writers, such as *Beza* and *Salmasius*, lay little weight on) one Argument from the Homonymie of the names of Bishop and Presbyter, and some Citations of the Fathers. Here we desiderate Ingenuity, both in his picking out our most doubtful Arguments, while he doth not [illegible] which

which were hardest for him to answer; also representing them in such a dress as we do not so make use of them, and they may be easiest for him to Debate. It had been fairer dealing if he had represented our cause in its full strength, and then answered what we say. Before I come to these Arguments which he is pleased to name, I shall propose some others which he, or some others, may consider, when next they think fit to write.

§. 2. Our first Argument shall be this: our Lord hath given power to Presbyters, not only to dispense the Word and Sacraments; but to rule the Church, and joyn in the exercise of the Discipline of the Church: but he hath given no majority of power to one Presbyter over the rest, nor made this exercise of that power to depend on one of them; therefore he hath not Instituted Prelacy, but left the Government of the Church to be exercised by Presbyters acting in paritie. The first Proposition many of the Episcopalians yield: yea, the Bishop of *Worcester* saith plainly, that *Christ hath given equal power to them all*; which is the foundation of his *Irenicum*. But it may be this Author will deny it; and therefore I shall prove it: to wit, that preaching Presbyters had power of Government and Discipline. 1. Preaching and ruling power are joyned, as given joyntly to the ordinary Pastors of the Church, *Heb.* 13. 7. The same persons who *watch for the peoples souls* (as all Pastors do) rule also over the Church, *ibid.* v. 17. they are called in both places ἡγούμενοι, *Leaders*: the word is used to express any kind of Authority, whether Civil, Military, or Ecclesiastick: but Church Rulers only can be here meant, *viz.* who speak the word of God to the people, and watch for their Souls; and such as they had at that time; seing they are bidden salute them, *v.* 24. To understand this of *Dyocesan Bishops*, as some do, is most absurd: for the ground on which Obedience is here enjoyned is, Preaching and Watching, which are things not peculiar to the Bishop: wherefore not he only is to be obeyed: and thence it followeth, that not he only doth rule in the Church. 2. They who are sent to teach and baptize Authoritatively in the Name of the Lord, and have power to command and require people (by vertue of their Commission from Christ) to obey what they enjoyn them, have also power of Spiritual correction of them who (professing subjection to Christ) do not obey his Laws: for we do not read that Christ committed to some the one of these powers, and the other to others: neither is there the least foundation in Scripture for that Fiction, that Christ impowered

ed Pastors to teach people and gather Churches, over whom he [illegible] afterward set some more eminent Pastor to rule them: the strain of Scripture seemeth to run contrary: That the Apostles gathered and settled Churches, and then committed the feeding and ruling of them to men of an inferiour Order. Yea, it were strange, if this had been designed, that no hint is given about that more eminent Pastor, that should afterwards be set over Pastors and people. Neither can it be imagined that the Office of begetting of Souls to Christ, can be separated from a power of correcting, as spiritual Fathers, or that Presbyters should be Pastors without governing power. 3. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. It is committed to the Elders that were in the Church, *to feed the flock, and take the oversight of them,* (ἐπισκοποῦντες) and *to beware of lording it over them,* which plainly saith that they had Authority; which they should beware of abusing, or stretching too far: now these Elders are told of their being accountable to Christ, but not a word of a superior Presbyter, or Bishop, to whom they must be answerable: and this power is given to as many as were Feeders, or πάντες; which cannot be denyed to Presbyters. It is true, the word Elder may be applied to a Bishop, yea to an Apostle, and the Apostle here designeth himself by it: tho he was more than an ordinary Elder: but that it cannot here be so restricted, appeareth, because the Injunction is to Pastors or Feeders in general, as hath been said.

§ 3. Our second Proposition of this Argument I prove, because all the grant of ruling that we meet with in Scripture, and all the Injunctions that are given to any to rule in the Church, do respect the people as the Object of that work; we find no Commission to any man to rule over the Pastors of the Church: let our Adversaries shew us such a Commission given to any man, either directly and expresly, or by good consequence. We read of feeding the Flock, 1 Pet. 5. 2. and *taking heed to themselves* (each of them) *and to the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers,* Acts 20. 28. Here are Bishops of the Flock, but no Bishop of Bishops, or of Pastors: they were to be corrected, not by one set over them, but each by the Meeting of the whole. Again, if the power of the Pastors of the Church (I mean them who dispense the Word and Sacraments to the people) did depend on the Bishop, is it imaginable that it should not have been told us that Ministers may not preach, nor baptize, &c. without the Bishops leave? This was needful to clear the Consciences of Ministers: Christ hath charged them to preach

preach, and that diligently; 2 *Tim.* 4, 1, 2. If the exercise of this power depend on the Bishop, he may supersede this Charge; neither can the Presbyter preach if the Bishop forbid him: now what Minister of the Gospel can satisfie his Conscience in this Matter, unless he see a clear warrand from the Scripture, that the Bishop hath this power over them. Further, this is to make all the Ministers of a Dioceses to have their Commission from the Bishop, and to be in a proper sense his Curats: which (tho I know some of our Brethren own, yet) hath this absurdity following on it, that it maketh the Ministers of the Gospel contemptible in the eyes of the People, who depend on them (not on the Bishop, whom, may be, they shall never see, nor hear) for the means of their Edification: this is not the way to put Ministers in a Capacity to edifie the people, it is to make them the servants of one Man, not Rulers in the house of God, under their Master Christ.

§ 4. Our second Argument we take from the Apostles enumeration of all the Officers that, by Divine appointment, are set in the Church: whether extraordinary, which are now ceased; or ordinary, which are to continue to the end of the World. But among all these there is no Bishop, with power over Presbyters; *ergo*, no such Officer is appointed by Christ: but the Church must be Governed by Presbyters acting in Parity, and without Subordination to such a superior Officer. That there is a full enumeration of all Church Officers that are of Divine appointment made in the Scripture, is evident; for an enumeration of them is often made, as *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Ephes.* 4. 11. This enumeration is either *complete* or *defective*: if *complete*, that is, what we desire: there can be no Church Officer owned, as *Juris Divini*, but what is in some of these places to be found: if any say that this enumeration is Defective; not only in some one of these places, but in them all: that is, that there is a Church Officer of Divine appointment that is found in none of them; he reflecteth a blame on the Holy Ghost, which an ordinary Writer (who pretendeth to any measure of candor & accuracy) would be ashamed of. The design of these Scriptures is to instruct the Church, what officers Christ hath appointed to be in his Church, that people may know from what sort of men they should receive Gods Ordinances, to whom they should Submit, whom they should hear and own. Now if there be some Officers whom Christ hath appointed to teach and rule his Church, who are not in some of these Catalogues mentioned, this is a lame instruction in this matter: and we

are ſtill at a loſs whom we ſhould own as Chriſts Embaſſadors to us, and what ſhould be our carriage toward them.

§ 5. I ſuppoſe the ſecond propoſition is that which our brethren will moſt controvert with us: which if they do, they muſt ſhew us where they find a *Dioceſan* Biſhop in any of theſe places, or in any other enumeration of Church officers; if they know of any more. Here ſome of them have put their invention on the Tenter-hooks, to find my Lord Biſhop among all theſe Church officers. If he be found *Rom.* 12. It muſt be *v.* 8. He that ruleth ὁ προϊστάμενος, I have met with none of them who inſiſt on this place. The current of Interpreters either hold in the general: mentioning rulers. So *Eſtius*, *Tolet*, *Hamond*: or underſtand it of ruleing Elders, who were diſtinct from preaching Presbyters, as *Vorſtius*, *Gomarus*, *Beza*, *Parræus*: *Grotius* alſo ſaith, they were οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, *de quibus* Tertull: *præſident probati quique ſeniores: horum erat diligenter attendere ad ſingulorum mores, monere titubantes, lapſos cenſura corrigere, Præſcribere pœnitentiæ tempus, & modum; interdum & relaxare.* No man will think that *Grotius* here meaneth a Dioceſan Biſhop, who hath many thouſands of Souls under his Charge, whoſe manners he cannot particularly inſpect. Some pretend that the Biſhop is deſigned 2 *Cor.* 12. 28. Under the name of *Governments*, Κυβερνήσεις: but firſt, it is plain that here is meant a ſort of Governour diſtinct from the Teacher, who is here alſo named: but this is not competent to the Biſhop; but to the ruling Elder. 2. Though an Argument drawen barely from the order wherein theſe Officers are mentioned, were not of much force; yet in this place, where the Apoſtle doth accuratly note the order and dignity of theſe Officers, by a firſt, and ſecondarly, and thirdly; it muſt needs be very ſignificant. Eſpecially ſeing our Oppoſites themſelves do take notice of the Apoſtles words as marking out out the Degrees of the dignity of theſe Officers. *Grotius*, and *Hamond*, *Eſtius* alſo, obſerves the eminency of the Apoſtles, from their being firſt mentioned, with this Note, firſt; the former two alſo on theſe words, *Secondarly Prophets*, call them *Apoſtolis honore proximos.* Let it then be conſidered, when the Apoſtle is ſo exact in ſetting down the order and dignity of Church Officers, whether it be conſiſtent with this, that Governments, if by them were meant Dioceſan Biſhops, ſhould be placed after the Paſtors and Teachers; that is Presbyters. If it be ſaid that *Helps*, whom we take to be Deacons, are ſet before *Governments*, whom we make ruling Elders; though the latter be of more reſpect in the Church than the former, I anſwer: after the Apoſtle hath ranked

ranked the chief Officers in the Church, both these who were extraordinarie, & who are ordinarie, he doth not use that exactness in these that are inferior of either sort: but while he doth expresly place the teachers (who are Presbyters) in the the third place of Dignity, it were absurd, either to take no notice of the place in which the Bishop should be ranked, or to put him behind the Presbyter. If any alledge that the Bishop is meant both by the *teacher*, and by *Governments*: this were to admit of an absurd tautologie in a very short list of Church Officers: beside that it were to exclude Preaching Presbyters, as no Officers in the house of God: for by this gloss no mention is made of any teaching Presbyter, except Bishops.

§ 6. Others fancy that they find Bishops under the name of Ἀντιλήψεις *Helps*: so *Grotius*, and *Hamond*: the latter laboureth to estabiish his Gloss, first, in that *Græci complures, quod hic est* Ἀντιλήψεις *explicant προστασίας*. But he is neither pleased to tell us who these Greeks are, nor what reason they give for this Explication. 2. He seemeth to plead that here is expressed a part of the Episcopal power, *cujus rei causa* (saith he) *est quod hæc erat specialis pars muneris Episcoporum, quod ipsorum fidei commissa est cura pauperum, & dispensatio facultatum Ecclesiæ: ut testantur Justin: Ignat: Polycarp: &c. Et Acts* 20. 35. This Author rather than not find a Bishop in the Text, he will turn him to a Deacon: contrarie to the Institution of Christ, by his Apostles *Acts* 6. 2, 3, 4. what *Justin*: &c. Say in this point, I cannot examine, because he hath not pointed to the places: but I am sure *Acts* 20. 35. saith no such thing: nor can I understand what should move this Author so to expound the place, unless it be because he findeth Ἀντιλαμβανέσθαι, in that Text, and he will force that word to express the work of a Bishop: it is plain, even from the records of antiquity, as well as from Scripture, that the Bishops had no further the Dispensation of the goods of the Church, than that the Ministers and Elders had a directive power in that matter, and the Deacons did execute what was appointed by them. But for the Text *Acts* 20. 35. It is far from aiming at any such matter: the Apostle setteth before them his Example, in working with his own hands; by which he did two ways support the infirm; both by spareing the Poors Stock, in his not taking the maintainence that he might have demanded, and also by giving of what he gained by his Labour, for their relief: I do not exclude from the meaning of this Text, Acts of mercy toward Souls, by spiritual instructions, and Consolations, Administred to distressed Consci-

ences. *Menoch. Estius, Piscator, Vorstius, Sclater, Beza,* apply this Text to both sorts of Support. *Aquinas in locum,* maketh them to be, *illi qui ferebant opem Majoribus prælatis in universali regimine sicut Archi-Diaconi Episcopis.* But to expound it of distributing the Churches Money, when it is rather to be understood of giving of our own to the Poor, is a strange Glosa. Further, if this meaning of the Text were admitted, and if a Bishop had a hand in the Distributions to the Poor, is it imaginable that, when the Apostle is about to instruct the Church about Divine Warrand for the chief Officer in the Church, that he would give us no clearer Light about so important a Matter, and that the Government of the Church and the practice of all her Members is so much concerned in, than by designing him by one of the lowest pieces of his Work; and which is most extrinsick to his Character? A Notion so absurd and ill founded, could hardly have been expected from a person of *Doctor Hammonds* learning. If the Bishop be here known by the name of *Help,* or *Supporter* of the Poor by Alms: that is the meanest (if any) part of his work: if by the designation of *Supporter* of afflicted Souls, by spiritual Advices and Directions, that is common to him with the Teacher, before mentioned in this Text; and so cannot be fit to distinguish him from other Church Officers.

§ 7. For *Grotius's* notion of Ἀντιλήψεις, I oppose, first, by the Argument already brought from the Order of Dignity the Apostle doth so critically observe in this enumeration of Church Officers. 2. By the force of the word: the native and genuine signification of which is, to *help, uphold,* or *support* one who is in hazard to fall: which I am sure, is rather done to the Poor by a Deacons work, or to a troubled Soul, by the work that is common to all Teachers in the Church, than by that work that is held to be peculiar to a Bishop. That learned Critick saith, it signifieth *curam alicujus rei gerere*; and referreth to his Commentary on *Luke* 1. 54. where I find he maketh it to answer to the Hebrew יִחֲזִיק which is to *strengthen*: and he saith it signifieth also *manu ducere,* because the *seventy* translated it Ἀντιλάβομαι. Here is a strange Argument, to proceed from a man of so profound Learning as is the great *Grotius*: for neither יִחֲזִיק nor Ἀντιλαμβάνομαι can be turned *manu ducere.* It is a stranger Argument *Jer.* 31. 32. that Hebrew word is by the *seventy* turned ἐπιλαβέσθαι τῆς χειρός: and *Acts* 23. 19. *Heb.* 8. 9. the same phrase is used for bringing the people of *Israel* out of *Ægypt*: for who knoweth not that Ἀντιλαμβάνομαι and ἐπιλαμβάνομαι have not the same signification:

signification: neither is תמך turned by ἀντιλαμβάνομαι, but when it is constructed with χειρί, the *hand*, laid hold on by another, being that by which one is supported, that he fall not as he goeth: and it is evident that the force of that word in these places, doth not so much import Gods guiding his people in their way, as his *manutenency* by which they are supported. From all which it is plain, that there is no sufficient ground brought by *Grotius*, why we should think that Ἀντιλήμψεις importeth any ruling power in them of whom it is to be understood. Further, if we should grant that this word signifieth to *take care of a thing*; will it follow thence that this care must needs be ruling care; when the word properly signifieth *upholding*, (to which indeed care is often needful) but it cannot be said that care is implyed in the word. I have been at the pains to look into all the places of the New Testament (as far as *Stephanus*'s Concordance could lead me) where that word, in any of its *derivata*, is used; and I cannot find one that hath any thing of the notion of ruling. Wherefore I must still abide in the Opinion which I have else where expressed, and have been by this my Antagonist severely censured for it, that this Criticism of *Grotius* is odd and groundless.

§ 8. These of our Episcopal brethren, who make the Bishops to be Successors to the Apostles in their Apostolick Office, will possibly say, that the Bishops are mentioned in the first place, in the Lists of Church Officers; *viz.* under the name of *Apostles*. Whether the Bishops be Successors to the Apostles or not, will fall in to be debated when I come to consider the second Chapter of this Book, which I am now examining: what I have now to do is, to shew that they are not meant by the *Apostles* mentioned in the Scriptures that are now under debate: which may plainly appear, if we consider first, that none of their own Commentators do so expound any of these places; nor can such a Fancy come into any mans head, when he considereth the Scripture without a present Byas on his mind, and laboureth to bring the Sense of the Scripture out of the words, and not into them. Yea, *Grotius*, and *Estius*, on 1 *Cor.* 12: 28. speaking of the Apostles there mentioned, have these words, *Illos nempe eminenter sic dictos, à Christo in id vocatos, ut prima Ecclesiarum fundamenta jacerent.* And *Doctor Hamond* saith, these Apostles were called *ut Ecclesias plantarent, & regerent, eadem potestate quam Christus à Patre habuit.* I hope none will say that this can be said of Bishops, or any ordinary and perpetual Officers in the Church. 2. It cannot

not be denyed, even by them who make the Bishops a kind of Apostles, and allow a sort of Apostolick power to them, but that they are another sort of Apostles than the first Apostles were: none will say that they are wholly the same, more than the Pastors of the Church are the same with the Prophets that were in the Apostolick Church: they must then distinguish the Apostles into extraordinary, who were sent immediatly by Christ, to plant Churches; and ordinary, who succeed to these, and whose work it is to rule the Churches that are already planted. Now to say that both these sorts are meant in these Lists, under the same name of Apostles, is to accuse the Spirit of God of darkness and confusion, in these Institutions where Light and Distinctness might be most expected: for in these Enumerations, he is instructing the Church what Officers she should own as of Christs appointment: but by the word Apostle she could never know that there are two sorts of Apostles to be owned: one sort all do acknowledge to be here meant; they who would have us believe that another sort of Apostles is also here meant, must give us some better ground for believing this, than a Synonimous word: *I* do not know how many sorts of Officers they may bring in under this name. *If* they may be allowed to divide the Apostolick Office at pleasure, and call every one of them who have any part of Apostolick work to do, a sort of Apostles: this is to expound Scripture at pleasure, and indeed to make it speak what we fancy. *I* conclude then, that Bishops have no Divine right for them, seing the Lord hath of purpose told us what Officers he hath appointed to be in his Church, both at first for planting of it, and afterward for managing her Affairs to the end of the World, and no Diocesan Bishop, name nor thing, is to be found among them.

§ 9. A third Argument for Parity, and against Prelacy, I take from the Commandment that Christ gives about the Administration of Church Discipline, *Mat.* 18: 17: that the offended Party (when other more private means of Redress do fail) should lay the case before the Church: whence this Argument doth clearly result; that Power which is by Christs Appointment to be exercised by many, is not *Jure Divino*, lodged in one person; but Church Jurisdiction is a Power that by Christs Appointment, is to be exercised by many; *Ergo*, it is not, *Jure Divino*, in the hand of one person, to wit, a Prelate. The *major* cannot be called in question: for if it were otherways, Christ should bid men act contrary to his own Institution; which to imagine, is most absurd. For the

the *minor Proposition*: Christs Injunction is, *tell it to the Church*; which word doth always signifie a plurality of men met about some common work; never a single person acting by himself. I need not here debate with *Erastians*, who by the Church understand the *Magistrate*: nor with *Independents*, who hence argue for the peoples Church power: these my present Antagonists condemn, as well as I do. But our Debate is with them who are for Church Monarchy: whether over the whole Church, as Papists; or over the several Districts in the Church, as Prelatists: both of them agree in this, that they place Church Jurisdiction in a single person; and by the Church, must here understand such a person. Against this conceit many Arguments may be drawn from the Text it self. First, the Gradation that Christ here recommendeth, in dealing with Offenders for their Amendment: that the offended person must first deal with the Offender by himself alone: next (that failling of its effect) he must take the Assistance of two or three: if this prevail not, he must bring the Matter to a greater number, to wit the Church. The learned *Drusius*, on this Text, citeth the Passage out of סֵפֶר הַמִּיסַר which sheweth, that this Gradation was used in the *Jewish* Church, and that as their Discipline, as the name of the Book importeth. After the Author hath enjoyned the first and second Step (as the Text doth) he addeth; *Si nec hoc modo quicquam profecit, debet eum pudefacere coram multis, ejusque delictum publicare*: which sheweth, that the third Step of Reprehension among them, was not to tell the Crime to a single person: wherefore when our Lords third Step is to tell it to the Church, it is not like he meant a single person, however of more Authority than the two or three.

§ 10. A second Proof of this is, the word *Church* ἐκκλησία, in Hebrew קָהָל, עֵרָה, is never so used; but always signifieth a *Plurality*: why should it then be so used here? 3. When Christ speaketh of a Ratification of the Sentence of this Church to whom the Complaint is made, and whom the stubborn Offender will not hear, he doth not speak of that Church as a single person: what *ye* shall bind, and what *ye* shall loose. 4. He speaketh of that Church which correcteth the Offender, as what may consist of a very small number, *two, or three, v.* 20. but giveth no hint that a single person can be so lookt on. 5. *Chrysostom* expoundeth this place of a Plurality; Προέδροις και προεστώσι, *Sutlif: de Pontif: Rom: lib: primo c:* 5. argueth against expounding this of the Pope, from such Topicks as will militate as much against understanding it of a Bishop

Bishop, in his District: his words are, *Per Ecclesiam non unus aliquis (nam hoc verbi ratio prohibet) sed plures Ecclesiæ præsidentes, intelliguntur. Ut autem unus Ecclesiæ summus Monarcha designetur per nomen Ecclesiæ, fieri non potest, repugnat enim natura & nomen Ecclesiæ, quæ est congregatio ex pluribus; & in uno consistere, si propriè loquimur, non potest: repugnat deinde & Patrum interpretatio, qui una voce non unum Pontificem, sed Episcopos & præsidentes Ecclesiæ; seu ut Patres Synodi Basileenses loquuntur, Ecclesiæ præsidentium concilium designari volunt*: Here is a plain Confession out of the mouth of an Adversary. For it is evident that Complaints must be made to lesser Churches, and not to the Universal Church only: and why one man set over a Province may be called the Church, and one set over all the Christian Church may not get the same Designation, is unaccountable. It is here objected by some, that this place is to be understood of the Jewish *Sanhedrim*, not of the Christian Church: and this they pretend to prove, because the incorrigible Offender is to be lookt on *as an Heathen or Publican*. To this I reply, first, if in the Jewish Church, where was an High Priest, there was not a Monarchical Government; much less is there ground for it in the Christian Church. 2. That Christ gave this Direction for the Christian Church, (which then was presently to be set up) is evident; because this Injunction is given to the Apostles, who had no hand in the Government of the Jewish Church; and the same power of *binding and loosing* which here is supposed to be in them, is expresly given, and called the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, *Mat.* 16: 19: *John* 20: 23: This alluding to Jewish Customes, and expressing New Testament Discipline by looking on scandalous impenitent Sinners *as Heathens and Publicans*, is no Argument against what I have said; this being frequent with Christ and his Apostles; yea with the Prophets, long before, to express Gospel matters by Old Testament terms.

§ 11. *Argument* 4. The Churches even in the time of the Apostles, were governed by Presbyters acting joyntly, without a Bishop set over them; *Ergo* the government of the Church by a Bishop set over Presbyters, is not of Divine Right: The Consequence cannot with any shew of Reason be denyed: for the Apostles were more vigilant and faithful, than to suffer such encroachment to be made upon a Power that Christ had given to his Servants. It is a most irrational fancy, that the Apostles in their own time, allowed Presbyters to govern the Church under their *Inspection*; but after their death appointed Bishops to rule alone.

For

For first, this had been to allow the exercise of a power in Presbyters, that not only they had no right to, but which did belong to others by Divine Institution. 2. What ground is there to say, that this ruling Power in Presbyters was but temporary, or that it ceased at the death of the Apostles? Especially considering that some of the Apostles did long outlive others of them; how should the expiring of that Power of Presbyters be determined: nor do we read of any ceasing of what Power they once had. This is a Fiction that no account can be given of. Wherefore our Debate is about the Antecedent of this Argument; which I must prove by Instances.

§ 12. And first the Church of *Corinth* was thus governed; not only by the Apostles connivance, but by his express Direction and Approbation; as in the case of *the incestuous man*, 1 *Cor.* 5. That a plurality of Church Rulers, and not a single person, had power to censure that man, is proved first; the Apostle, *v.* 2. reproveth their Negligence in that they had not cast out this man from among them by Excommunication; they were not duely affected with the Crime, and did not mourn for it; neither did set about censuring of it: both these were the effects of their not being so sensible of the evil of it, as they ought to have been: In this sense *Ambrose* understands this place: for on this occasion he saith, *Si autem quis potestatem non habet, qui scit reum abjicere, vel probare non valet; immunis est.* So also *Chrysostom*, on the place ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ συναχθέντων ὑμῶν: *non accusat quod non ei significarint; sed quod non deplorarent ut tolleretur: ostendens quod etiam sine monitore id fieri opportuit, propter peccati evidentiam.* What can be more plain, than that these Fathers lookt on a Community of Church Rulers in *Corinth*, as having the power of Church Censures? Yea, that the Apostle thought so too; otherways he could not have charged them with neglecting this Matter. 2. The Apostle giveth his Opinion, that this scandalous person should be Excommunicated (*delivered to Satan*) by them assembled together; (not by one Bishop among them, and of this their assembling for this end, he saith two things; which imply their power: that his Spirit should be with them; that is his good Wishes, Approbation, and hearty Concurrance) *Menoch: in locum; congregatis vobis quibus ego adsum præsens Spiritu, affectu, & Sollicitudine.* Next, that this was to be done by them in the Name and Authority of Christ, and with his Power, or Vertue, by which he would bless this his own Ordinance, and make it effectual: none of these could be said of this Act, if it were done by a Company of men who had no

power from Divine Institution. 3. The Apostle saith expresly *v.* 12. that *they* (not thou Bishop, but ye) *judged them who were within*; that is the Church Members. 4. The Apostle speaking of this Excommunication when it was past, saith, that it was the *rebuke of many*, 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. not of one Bishop. 5. He after directeth the Church Rulers to take off this Sentence, the man being now truly penitent, 2 *Cor.* 2:7. which is an Act of Church Authority, and they could not take off the Sentence if they had not power to lay it on.

§ 13. Our Adversaries make some Exceptions against this Argument. First, that the Apostle doth not enjoyn the *Corinthian* Elders to Excommunicate the man; because he saith, κεκρικα, *I have judged*: he passed the Sentence, and enjoyned them to publish, and execute it. This is said without ground: for it is evident, that the Sentence was not passed when this Epistle was written; as is clear from the Arguments above adduced: the man was not yet purged out, he was not delivered to Satan: the Apostle saying he had judged already, κεκρικα; signifieth no more but that it was his Opinion, in which, after deliberation, he was determined, that the thing should be done: beside, that his judging did not exclude the Presbyters judging with him, more than when *James* said *Acts* 15. 17. ἐγω κρινω, *I judge*, it barred the authoritative Judgment of that Council that sat with him. Again they except, that these Presbyters were not at libertie to excommunicate this man or not, seing the Apostle had commanded it; *Ergo*, this Excommunication was not in their power. Reply: the Consequence is naught: for this necessity did not proceed from their want of power, but from the plain discoverie of their Dutie, held forth to them by the Apostle. Any Minister of the Gospel may require any person to do that which is a plain Dutie; and yet not deprive the person of his power in that Act. When the Prophets held forth the Mind of God to Kings about any Act, they did not take away their Regal power that they had for these Acts. 3. They alledge that this delivering the man to Satan, was not Excommunication; but an extraordinary inflicting some bodily Punishment upon him, which only the Apostle, and others having the Gift of Miracles, could do: and therefore it cannot argue any power in the Presbyters of *Corinth.* Reply: This Exposition of the place (though I deny not some of the Fathers have used it) is without all ground, or example in Scripture; and a pure Invention to serve a turn. Again, the Apostle reproveth the *Corinthians* that they had not done this; bid them

them, with his Spirit joyning with them, do it: but it was never heard, that they who wrought Miracles did it with the Concurrence of others: Further, this Punishment was inflicted by many, to wit the Elders of *Corinth*; but they had no power of working Miracles. Lastly, *Erastus* (the chief Abetter of this Opinion in these latter ages) held that this power was given to the Apostles, and some others, till there should be a Christian Magistrate in the Church, to punish Scandals: from this it would follow, that the Magistrate should now purge out by death, all the Scandals which the Apostle appointed to be purged out by Excommunication, or *delivering to Satan*; such as Drunkards, Fornicators, Railers, *&c.* which are mentioned 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. which would make the Church like a Shambles.

§ 14. Another instance of a Church governed by a Plurality of Presbyters, and not by a Bishop, is that of *Thessalonica*. 2 *Thess.* 3. 14. where the Apostle enjoyneth them to *note*, or *set a mark upon* such as obey not the Apostles word, and to withdraw from them: this *note*, is the ignominious Mark of Excommunication, which should make a persons company be shunned by all Christians. *Erasmus in locum, ut signamus boves cornupetas, quo vitentur*: my Argument from this Text is this, the Colledge of Presbyters at *Thessalonica* had power, and that by the Apostles allowance, to Excommunicate them who were disobedient to the Rules of the Gospel; *Ergo*, they, and not a single Bishop, did govern the Church. The Consequence is plain: the Antecedent is founded on the Apostles Injunction: he commandeth them to exercise this Discipline; which he would not have done, if they had not had Authority so to do. Neither doth he here design the person or persons, who were to be Excommunicated; but owneth them for proper Judges of that, and giveth a general Rule by which they should judge, telling for what Crimes this Censure should be inflicted. The Prelatists labour to take off the strength of this Instance, by another reading, and Gloss, on this Text: they read it thus, *if any man obey not our word, note, or signifie that man by an Epistle, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed.* So that they make this to be the Apostles meaning: that they should write to him, giving him an account of the Scandals that should fall out among them, to the end that he might Excommunicate the guilty persons, and then the Church should shun their company: the Presbyters were to examine the Matter, and find it sufficiently proved; and upon their Information the Apostle was to pass Sentence.

§ 15. To this I oppose, for strengthening our Argument; 1. This reading of the Text is contrarie to the Current of the Greek Interpreters; *Æcumenius*, *Theophylact*, *Basilius*, *Ephrem Cyrus*, all cited. *Altar: Damasc: p.* 201. Yea though *Estius* cite some who are for that reading, yet approveth our reading in these words; *Si quis non auscultat præcepto meo, quod per hanc Epistolam significo*: he also, and *Menochius*, make the design of this Noteing to be *ut vitetur ab omnibus*; which could not properly, nor immediatly result from their Complaint and Information sent to the Apostle: of which more after. The *Syriack* Version, as also the *Arabick*, doth read this place as we do. 2. The Greek σημειοῦσθε, cannot bear this Interpretation: for it signifieth to set a Mark on a person, or thing; not to give Notice, which is the signification of σημαίνω. *Scapula* rendereth the first word (which is the word of the Text) *insignio, noto*: and he citeth for it *Grægor*: τὼ ἀληθίνω φωτὶ σημειούμενα πρόσωπα. And *Athen: lib.* 2. καὶ σημειῶσαι φησὶ τοὺς θηρμοκναμοὺς: but σημαίνω, he turneth, *signum do, significo*: and giveth sufficient authority for that signification. In the New Testament I find not this word but in this place: for σημαίνω, it is used *John* 12. 33. and 18. 32. and 21. 19. *Acts* 11. 28. and 25. 27. And it is evident, to all who read these places, that it cannot signifie to set a Mark on a thing; but to signifie, or hold forth. It must then be to put force on the Text, to draw it to express their giving notice, by a Letter to the Apostle, of the mans faults. 3. It is evident that the Apostle speaketh of *this Epistle* of his; not of *an Epistle* to be written to him from that Church: for he saith not by *an Epistle*; but by *the Epistle*, Διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς: the demonstrative Particle doth restrain the signification to that Epistle which he sent to them; which Epistle brought to them the word that they should obey, but could not bring from them, to him, notice of what Scandals fell out among them. 4. Upon this noting of that man, did immediatly, and necessarly, follow their abstaining from the company of the person so noted; as is clear in the Text: which cannot be said of their giving notice to the Apostle of any Scandal among themselves, because the Apostle (notwithstanding of their informatary Letter) might not think fit to Excommunicate the person accused, either because the Crime was not relevant, or the Proof not sufficient; but it must needs follow on their setting the Mark of Excommunication on him.

§ 16. *Argument* 5. If even the Apostles in settled Churches, did not exercise any part of ordinary Church Discipline, or such as was to continue

tinue in the Church, by themselves, and without the Authority, or the authoritative Concurrence of the Presbytrie; then Bishops may not do it: but the former is true, *Ergo*: I think the connection of the *Major* will not readily be denyed: nor can it; unless our Brethren will exalt their Bishops higher than Christ did his Apostles, and give them a Power that is wholly boundless. They cannot alledge, that the Apostles might have used such a Power if they would. For that is to be proved: and further, their not using it, was a binding example to them who should come after them, from which they ought not to swerve. Before I come to the proof of the Assumption, I take notice of two Cases in which the Apostles used a singular Power, by themselves, in the matter of Church Discipline, or Correption, or other Church Acts. First, when a bodily Punishment was miraculously to be inflicted; as in the case of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*. 2. When Discipline was to be exercised in a Church not yet constituted, nor furnished with them who had the ordinary Power; as many think, in the case of *Hymenæus* and *Philetus*. *Saravia*, a great Patron of Prelacy, *defen. Cap.* 20. § 2. hath these words: *Apostolos & Evangelistas, rebus & Ecclesiis jam constitutis, & in Parochias Episcopis distributis, nihil quod ad communem Ecclesiæ statum pertinuisset fecisse facturos inconsultis & invitis locorum Pastoribus, & Episcopis; me firmiter credere.* That the Apostles in other cases did not act by themselves, but with the Presbyterie, I prove by Instances of their acting in conjunction with the Presbyterie: and I challenge our Brethren to bring Instances to the contrary. First, *Paul* did not ordain *Timothy* by himself; but with the Presbyters: though the *laying on of his hands* be mentioned by it self: 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. yet, that the Presbyterie concurred is clear, 2 *Tim.* 4. 14. The effect of the Imposition of Hands is ascribed to that of the Presbyterie, as well as to that of the Apostle; which is a clear Indication of a joint Power. 2. The Apostle did not, by himself, Excommunicat the *Incestuous Corinthian*; as hath been shewed. 3. The Apostles did not judicially determine the Question about observing the Law of *Moses*; *Acts* 15. by themselves, but with *the Elders and Brethren*. They object that the Apostle by himself delivered *Hymenæus* and *Philetus* to Satan. It is to be proved by the Objecters, first, That these two men were Members of a settled and complete Church. 2. That if so, the Apostle did this by himself, without the Concurrence of the Presbyterie: neither of which can be proved.

§ 17. *Argument*

§ 17. *Argument* 6. We find no Superiority of Power that one had over the reſt, in any ſort of Church Officers; *Ergo*, it is not among the Paſtors or Teachers of the Church neither. The Antecedent is clear: if we go through all the ſorts of Officers mentioned in the Scripture: there was no Apoſtle had power over the reſt, as all confeſs who are not for *Peters* and the Popes Supremacy. No ſuch Diſparity among Prophets, or Evangeliſts, or among the Governments, or ruling Elders, nor among Deacons. I confeſs after Ages brought in a Diſparity among all theſe Orders, and invented new ones: it was no wonder then, that an *Arch-Presbyter*, or *Biſhop*, was brought in too: but no Foundation in Scripture (which alone can found a Divine Right) for any ſuch Diſparity or Subordination. The conſequence cannot be denyed, unleſs our Adverſaries can prove, that this Diſparity is Inſtituted by the Lord; though no ſuch Diſparity in the reſt of the Orders be: which they ſhall never be able to do. It were ſtrange, if the Lord ſhould intend a Majority of Power of one Paſtor over another, and yet not Him that Diſparity, when he is ſetting down all the Officers in his Houſe: and while that he hinteth no Majoritie among any one of the ſorts of Church Officers, this only ſhould admit of ſuch Subordination. I have brought theſe few Arguments for Paritie, and againſt Prelacy, that the Reader might ſee how ſlightly, and unfairly, my Antagoniſt dealeth with us, when he will have the World believe that we have no ſufficient Arguments, becauſe he hath refuted one or two of them, which he was pleaſed to ſingle out, as eaſieſt for him to deal with.

SECTION IV.

The Arguments for Parity which our Author pretendeth to anſwer, Vindicated.

I Took notice in the beginning of the former Section, that this Author ſingleth out ſome of our Arguments, and theſe none of the moſt evident, and with a great deal of Confidence triumpheth over them, as if he had laid our Cauſe in the duſt: I ſhall now try if even theſe Weapons, rightly managed, be able to wound his Cauſe; for as he repreſenteth them, they can do us little ſervice: but his unfair dealing will appear in this Conduct. Before I come to the Arguments themſelves, I cannot overlook the general account that he giveth of the Arguments on our ſide, *p.* 15. That *they may all be reduced to three Heads.*

Firſt,

First, either they pretend that this Parity of Presbyters is expresly commanded by our Saviour. Or 2. They endeavour to support it by Consequences from several Texts of Scripture. Or 3. from some Testimonies of the ancient Writers of the Church. The latter two sorts of Arguments we do indeed use, but who ever pretended to the first, I know not. I confess, I no where read in Scripture Paritie of Presbyters named, nor such words as these, that the Church shall be in all ages governed *communi Presbyterorum consilio*, nor that it hath been *Petro* said, there shall be no Prelacy among Presbyters: and *I* am sure, the Scriptures that he mentioneth as containing our Arguments of this sort, were never said by any of us, to be an expres Command for Paritie; though we hold it to be a full and plain Command implyed, and which may be drawn out of the words by good Consequence. He saith *p.* 16. *the Scots Presbyterians do more frequently insist on this* (arguing from expres command in Scripture) *than any of the forraign Presbyterians*: which appeareth to be an injurious Imputation, from what hath been said: for many of the forraign Presbyterians do assert the Divine Right of Presbytrie as fullyas we do, though *I* cannot reckon the frequency of either their, or our insisting on it, that *I* may compare them, *I* am sure many more of them have written for it, than have defended it so in Print, in *Scotland* (*I* mean the Parity of Presbyters, which is the *cardo controversiæ*; whatever difference may be between some of them and us, in some other things) *Calvin. instit. lib. 4. c. 11. § 6. & alibi. Beza, de triplici Episcopatu contra Sarav. Paræus, sæpissime. Gerf. Bucer. disser: de gub: Eccles. Blondell: apologia. Salmasius, Turretin, loc. 18. question: 29. Leideck. de statu Eccles. Affric. Voet. passim. Vitringa, de syn. Vet.* and many others. Likewise *Smectym. & jus div: regim:* were not written by *Scots* Presbyterians: also *Paul Bayn Dioces: Tryal.*

§ 2. The Argument from expres command in Scripture which he insisteth on, is *Mat.* 20. 25, 26, 27, 28. and *Mark* 10. 42, 43, 44, 45. and *Luke* 22. 25. We think here is a strong and concludent Argument against Prelacy and for Parity; though we did not call it an expres Command. As a foundation for our Argument from this Scripture, let it be considered, that this Discourse of Christ is immediatly and directly to the Apostles, to whom he was then speaking; and by consequence, it may be applyed to all other Orders of Church Officers, ordinary and extraordinay. It is a good consequence, Christ here forbiddeth Prelacy among the Apostles; *Ergo*, among the ordinary Pastors of the Church likewise. And *ergo*, among the Elders, whose work it is to rule.

rule. And *ergo*, among the Deacons: our Lord is not here saying that there shall be no diversity of Degrees, or Orders of Officers, in the Church; for he hath plainly Instituted the contrary, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. But among the Apostles there shall be no Soveraignty, nor Subjection, neither among other Officers who are of the same Order, and whose work is the same. 2. Let it be also noted, that our Lord doth not here mention the Tyranny, or abuse of power, that was exercised among the Heathen Magistrats, over them who were subordinate to them; but only Dominion and Authority, which they might lawfully exercise: so that what he aimeth at is, that there was Subjection and Superiority among the Heathen Rulers; but no such thing should be among Church Rulers. 3. Though we deny not that there are, by Christs Appointment, divers Orders of Church Rulers; yet we see no ground to think that one of these Orders is subject to another, or is to be commanded by it: we hold that Ministers have no Jurisdiction over the ruling Elders; but they are co-ordinate in the Government of the Church. Before I state our Argument from this Text, I observe how groundlesly he bringeth this as the chief Topick that we use, and (overlooking all of our side who have learnedly and fully pleaded that Cause) he only citeth as pleading from this Scripture, Mr. *David Dickson* on *Matthew*; who toucheth it very transiently, and on occasion of his commenting on that Text: and my Book against *Stillingsfleets Irenicum*, where it is said expresly *p.* 98. *I confess there be other places more unquestionable to our purpose:* nor do I there use that place as an Argument, further than to clear it from the Exceptions of my Antagonist; which is here also my work. I now draw this Argument from the words cited. That Dominion and Authority that Civil Magistrats in their several Jurisdictions did, and might, exercise over these Under-rulers, is not to be allowed in the Church; but the Jurisdiction of Bishops over Presbyters is such a Dominion and Authority, (that is, the one is real Jurisdiction as well as the other) *Ergo* it should not be exercised in the Church.

§ 3. I shall now examine his Answers to this Argument. First, he saith that *Christ here supposes Degrees of Subordination among his own Disciples, as well as other Societies; and therefore*, he saith, *this Text referreth to the Methods of attaining Preferment; that is must not be by force, violence, and other Arts that are so fashionable in Secular Courts*: thus he *p.* 17, and *p.* 19. *he commandeth them that they should not exercise their Jurisdiction as the Lords of the Gentiles, by a spirit of Pride and Domination.* This and what follow.

followeth he seemeth to have borrowed from *Grotius, de imp. summar potes. circa sacra. p.* 339. who yet was as little for the Divine Right of Prelacy; as of Parity. To all this I oppone first, That Christ supposeth here Subordination among his Disciples is *gratis dictum*. I deny not that there is Subordination among them (taking his Disciples for all Christians; but taking the word for the Apostles alone we deny it) and that both in respect of Degree and Authority. The people are subject to the Rulers; one sort of Church Officers is inferior to another; which they may be, without being subject to their Authority: but there is no ground for inferring this Subordination from what is here said: for mens *Ambition* prompts them to make superior Offices in the Church, that themselves may enjoy them; as well as to aspire to these Preferments that are extant and allowed. Again, Christ saith not, there shall be no Superiority in the Church; but *among them*, the Apostles. This is evident from the occasion of this Discourse; which was the ambitious address of *James* and *John* presented to Christ by their Mother; that they might be preferred to the rest of the *Apostles*, in that worldly kingdom that they imagined Christ was to have on Earth: they aimed at such Authority as Civil Magistrats have, the Superior over the Inferior: our Lord telleth them his Kingdom was not of that nature; neither was there any such Subordinations to be among his Apostles. 3. That Christ here *recommendeth Humility, and condemneth Ambition and Pride*, cannot be denyed; the occasion given for this Discourse led him to it: but that this is the only Scope of his Discourse, is said without all Warrant: for he forbiddeth that Dominion and Authority that was among Civil Rulers, to have place among them; which yet might be exercised by humble men. 4. That *his scope is to forbid the exercise of their Apostolick or Episcopal Jurisdiction by a spirit of Pride and Domination*, is also said without Book: That this he condemneth, we acknowledge: but that he only condemneth this, and not Monarchical Jurisdiction it self, is a groundless fancy, and contrary to the words of the Text, which mention the one, but not the other. He telleth them also, *Mat.* 23. 8. that *they were all brethren*: where *Camero* observeth that *Damnat rem tituli; viz. magisterium & authoritatem.* 5. It cannot be said, that all the Rulers among the Gentiles, were proud and tyrannical; though not a few were such: but here Christ forbiddeth that Domination that was among the Heathen (yea it may extend to Christian) Magistrats, whether they obtain it ambitiously, and exercise it tyrannically, or not. *It shall*

not be so (as in the Civil State where Dominion and Authority is exercised) *among you.* The two Brethren sought an Authority which they fancied would be in Christs Kingdom; not which he intended or instituted: and our Lord not only told them that no such thing was to be expected by any person in his Kingdom, that one Apostle should be above another, or one of the ordinary Pastors of the Church should have Jurisdiction over another; and so of the other Orders of Church Rulers: but he also reproveth their Ambition in so seeking such preferment, if any such thing were to be in the Church.

§ 4. His second Exception against our Argument is, p. 18. *The Apostles exercised such Jurisdiction over inferior Ecclesiasticks, therefore they did not so understand Christs words, as forbidding all Prelation in the Church.* This is sufficiently obviated by what is already said: they did not understand it as forbidding all Prelation in the Church; but among themselves: *It shall not be so among you.* Yea, they did not understand it as forbidding Superiority of Degree or Order; but Jurisdiction over Church Rulers; such as is in the Civil State, over inferior State Rulers. His third Exception, which he saith *doth baffle and expose this Argument to all Intents and Purposes* (big words, as his manner is, when the Matter is very improportionate) *that he* (*our Lord*) *did that himself among them, which now he commanded them to do to one another; and therefore the doing of that toward one another, in obedience to the Command, should not infer a Parity; unless they blasphemously infer, that Christ and his Apostles were equal.* This is far more easily *baffled*, and more *exposed*; if what hath been said be duely considered. But further that our Lord setteth before them an Example of Humility, and being far from ambitious Aspiring, doth no ways infer their Paritie with him; unless he were here only discharging Paritie among the Apostles; which we do not say, but have asserted the contrary. He is also condemning the Ambition and Pride that appeared in *James and John*, and which he well knew would be found in Church men afterwards; and with respect to that, he setteth his own Example of Modesty and Humility before them. Hence it appeareth that there is no *Infatuation in owning the Scheme of Parity* (as he fancieth p. 19.) but rather that drawing such a Consequence from that Scheme, deserveth that Reproach. That the Apostle *Paul*, and the Fathers of the Church, carried as Servants under the Apostolical or *Episcopal* Dignity, proveth nothing against us: beside that we own no *Episcopal* Dignity in the Fathers; but shall controvert it with him when he will.

If

If *Wale Meſſalinus* (as he ſaith *p.* 20.) *layeth no great ſtreſs on the Argument from the Text*, and mean, that we have ſtronger Arguments; I do not differ from him: and if *Beza* ſay, *that here is not forbidden all Juriſdiction*; I have already ſaid the ſame. He maketh yet a 4th Attempt on this Argument, *p.* 20, 21. That *in the Jewiſh Church there was a Hierarchie, and Subordination, by Divine appointment*: *and if our Saviour had pulled down that ancient Policy, and commanded an Equality among the Preſbyters of the New Teſtament, he would not have ſtated the Oppoſition betwixt his own Diſciples and the Lords of the Gentiles*; *but between them and the Prieſts of the Moſaick Oeconomie*: *as he doth when he reproveth the corrupt Gloſſes introduced into the Church by the Scribes and Phariſees*. The weakneſs of this Reaſoning will plainly appear, if we conſider 1. That it is too great ſawcineſs in us, to teach our Lord how to reaſon: If he think fit to make uſe of one Topick, and if it be to the purpoſe (as all that he ſaith muſt needs be, and what is here ſaid is manifeſtly ſo) we ought not to preſume to ſay he would have uſed another Argument, if he had ſo meant. Indeed if our Adverſaries can make it appear that this way of Reaſoning was not here apt, we ſhall yield that Chriſt did not mean as we think he did: But that can never be done. 2. He falſly ſuppoſeth that we diſown all Subordination in the Church, and that we think Chriſt here did intend to condemn it. 3. The Old Teſtament had not been ſo pertinent an Example here, becauſe it was now to be diſſolved, our Lord would no longer allow it in the Church; whereas the Magiſtratical Authoritie, in the ſeveral Subordinations of it, was to continue; and he would have a Difference between the Church and State, to be continually viſible in this very thing. Beſide that the Old Teſtament Hierarchie is no more a Pattern for Epiſcopacy, than for Parity; unleſs our Author will ſay we muſt have a Pope, as they had a High Prieſt, with univerſal Authoritie over the Church. 4. Our Lords reproving the falſe Gloſſes brought in by the Scribes and Phariſees, is ſtrangely drawn in here, and the Impertinency of it is unaccountable; for how could he mention any other as bringing theſe Doctrines, than the true Authors of them: as he elſe where warneth his Church of Heathen Doctrines and Practices, and then he nameth them, and not the Teachers of the Jewiſh Church. The other Text *p.* 21. we never uſed by it ſelf, as an Argument againſt Epiſcopacy: and we deny that the Text now conſidered, hath been *underſtood* in his ſenſe *from the beginning*.

§ 5. He next *p.* 22, *&c.* falleth on another of our Arguments, which (he saith) *is taken from the Homonymie of Bishop and Presbyter, and the Dichotomizing of the Clergy into* Bishops *and* Deacons, *in the New Testament*: and he referreth us to *Cotel: in Ep: Clement*: who saith, that in these Epistles, *Solide demonstratur, argumentum à confusione nominum nequaquam jurisdictionem & autoritatem Episcoporum supra Presbyteros labefactare posse*. Had he produced to us these solid Demonstrations, we should have considered them: my work is to answer his Book, not all the Books that he thinketh fit to refer us to, or that he hath found cited, and recommended by some Author that he hath seen or heard of. Before I come to examine what he bringeth to weaken this Argument, I must observe how unfavourably; yea how unfairly he representeth it. In order to this the Reader may know, that Presbyterians do not argue from the confusion of Names, nor from the Dichotomy of Church Officers alone. We know there are few or none of them who do not sometimes interchange Names; an Apostle is called Διάκονος, also *Presbyter*, as any Embassador of Christ (yea of the Churches) is called *Apostle*: all ruling Officers are called *Bishops*. Likeways Diochotomys are used where one of the divident Members may be sub-divided. Our Author had dealt more candidly, if he had represented our Argument in its full strength: especially considering that the Authors whom he citeth as using this Argument, do not so state it as he doth. *Smectym*: argueth from the same Names, and the same Offices, given to Bishop and Presbyter, *p.* 17. *Altar. Damasc. p.* 204. argueth from the perpetual confusion of these Names, and that the Scripture never distinguisheth them. Mr. *Durham, on Revel. p.* 224. *edit. Lond.* 1648. mentioneth frequent and universal confounding of them. The other Authors whom he citeth I have not at hand, nor need I call for them: what is said being enough to shew how he murdereth our Argument secretly, lest it be too hard for him if he deal fairly with it. He should also have considered that this Argument is not brought only by the latter Presbyterians; but by the Fathers also, as Mr. *Durham* sheweth *p.* 224. *& seq.* But I shall not now insist on their Testimonies, they may after fall to be brought in.

§ 6. This being premised, our Argument is this. In Scripture the names Bishop and Presbyter are always used for the same Church Officer; neither are two sorts of Officers ever distinguished by these names; nor are distinct Offices, or sorts of Work, implyed by these names; nor when

when Church Officers are dichotomised into Bishops and Deacons, do any other Scriptures give ground to think that some of these Bishops had Jurisdiction over others? *Ergo*, there were no *Diocesan Bishops*, *Jure Divino*. Or, our Argument may be framed thus: where the Scripture uses neither distinct Names, nor maketh distinct Offices, nor giveth different Rules, or Injunctions, about their Work, or Qualifications; there it doth not acknowledge distinct Officers, one ruling over another: but thus it is with Bishops and Presbyters, *Ergo* If my Antagonist can bring sufficient ground from Scripture, that Bishop and Presbyter are found distinct, either name or thing; not only this Argument, but all that we have brought, or that can be brought, must fall to the ground; for Scripture cannot be contradicted, neither by Reason, nor by it self. *Bellarm: de cler: lib: 1. c: 15: § 6, 7.* could not answer this Argument otherways, than by saying, *these Names were confounded in the Apostles days; but the Church did afterward distinguish them*: So also *Lorinus, in Acts* 20. saith, *they were then one, as the word* Pope *was first applyed to all Church men of note*: and indeed the Prelacy of a Bishop over Presbyters, and of a Pope over Bishops, had the same Original, though the one was some latter than the other. A notable Confirmation of this Argument may be drawn from the *Syriack* Translation (the oldest and neerest to the Greek, as *Walton* demonstrateth *Apparat: ad Bibl: Polyglot: p:* 90. which never useth the word *Bishop* at all, but only קשישא *Presbyter*, or *Senior*, from קשש *consenuit*: and קשישותא *Presbyteratus*.

§ 7. I come to examine what my Antagonist bringeth against this Argument. He assaults it briskly, calling it *Childish, and Sophistical, p:* 22. which he might the better do, because he had put it in his own dress, and had concealed its strength from his Reader and himself. He saith, *it is not material whether we own a Bishop to be of the same, or a different order from a Presbyter*. This I take for a Concession: he saith, *in order to the Priesthood, and with respect to subordinate Church Officers, they are of the same order*: *But when Authority and Jurisdiction is named, the* Bishop *(with regard to his Dignity and Power) is always reckoned above a Presbyter*. I know not well how to reconcile this Distinction with his denying this Question to be material: for what he here asserteth is so material, that it containeth the main thing in debate between Prelatists and Presbyterians. Far less do I understand how it appeareth, that in Scripture (for of that we now debate, whether Bishop and Presbyter are lookt on as the same in Sacred Writings) a Bishop is always reckoned above a Presbyter,

Presbyter, where Authority and Jurisdiction is mentioned. I confess I am unacquainted with such Passages of Scripture: I wish he had named some of them for our Instruction. We bring to the contrary *Acts* 20: 28: *Phil:* 1: 1: 2 *Tim:* 3: 1: all which himself mentioneth. The first thing that he opposeth to our Argument is, that *p:* 23: he proveth at great length, that *the Jews, both in the first ages of that Church, and also afterward, did dichotomise their Clergy into Priests and Levites; though there was a High Priest above the other Priests, who also had their Subordinations. And therefore* (saith he) *the Apostles and Apostolick men made use of the current Phraseology*: thus he *p:* 25. I shall not contradict him in this Assertion: nor be much concerned what respect the Apostles had to the Phraseology used by the *Jews*. But nothing of this meeteth with our Argument; unless he will affirm, and prove, that this Dichotomy was so used as that no Distinction was ever made, either by Name, or any other Character, of the High Priest from the rest; or of the Heads of the several Orders of Priests: *David*, by the Spirit of God, distinguished them from these Priests that were under their Charge. If he prove not this, he saith nothing to the purpose. and this he will not, I hope, attempt, the Scripture being so full and plain to the contrary; and that in all the ages of the Jewish Church, from *Aaron* to *Christ*. If he will let us see these special *Masteries and Jurisdictions whereby Bishops were in the New Testament, distinguished from Presbyters*, as he confesseth *p:* 26. The High Priest was distinguished from the other Priests, even in these times when he saith the distinction of Names was least noticed, we shall pass from this Argument as inconcludent: but this he can never do; neither hath he attempted it: wherefore our Argument is not yet touched by him. I shall not adventure to list my self among his *Ignoramus's*, whom he setteth that mark on, that *think he pleadeth that there ought to be a Bishop above Presbyters, because there was a High Priest among the Jews*; though some of his Brethren use this Plea, and himself in the very next words seemeth not to be very far from it, while he saith, *but rather thus* (I plead) *that the Hierarchy that obtained in the Patriarchal and Jewish Æconomie, was never abrogated in the new.* If it be not abrogated, sure it standeth in force, and is of Divine Right to this day: and if so, we must have *Jure Divino*, not only a Bishop over the Presbyters of every Province, but a Pope over all these, for so it was in the Jewish Æconomy.

§ 8. He

§ 8. He ſaith p. 28. that *the firſt Presbyter, or* Πρῶτος, *in the Apoſtolick age, he that was veſted with a* Proſtaſia, *was as much above the ſubordinate Presbyters, as the High Prieſt among the Jews was above other Prieſts.* This is boldly aſſerted; but we ſee no proof for it. We deny not that in their Meetings there was one who preſided; but that there was one diſtinguiſhed from the other Presbyters who had this for his Work conſtantly, we find not: alſo that the *Præſes* in theſe Meetings, had the ſame power (either Extenſive or Intenſive) with the High Prieſt among the Jews, is an abſurd and unproved Aſſertion. The Conceſſion made by *Salmaſius* maketh nothing againſt us; *viz.* that *there was a* Præſes: but that that learned Author held, that in the Apoſtolick age there was one perſon to whom the *proto cathedria* was conſtantly due, we deny; though we yield that in after ages this uſage was brought in; yet without Superiority of Power. He ſaith *p.* 29. that *there are ſuch manifeſt and palpable Evidences of this peculiar Honour and Juriſdiction due to one of the Eccleſiaſtical Senate, in the Apoſtolick age, that the learned Stickers for Paritie cannot deny it.* His proof of this he bringeth from the *Apocalyptick Angels*, from *Timothy* and *Titus*, and from the *Succeſſion of Biſhops* gathered about the middle of the ſecond Century: and this proof he will have to be *beyond all contradiction.* Here were a large Field for Obſervations, if one were in the humour to expoſe this Diſcourſe. I ſhall take no further notice of his groſs Miſtakes, than the Vindication of Truth maketh neceſſary. Firſt, whoever they be that ſtickle for Paritie, and yet acknowledge a Juriſdiction due to ſome of the Eccleſiaſtical Senat; either in the Apoſtolick, or the next following Ages, they are not only not the learneſt men; but they cannot be reckoned men of a common meaſure of Underſtanding: what man of Senſe will ſtickle for an Opinion, and yet expreſly yield it to his Adverſary? I deny not but ſome Presbyterians yield, that early in the primitive times there was a peculiar Honour given to the Πρῶτος; but that any of them do carry it ſo high as the Apoſtolick age, is more than I know: I wiſh he had named them, and pointed to the places where theſe Conceſſions are found in their Writings: far leſs do I know any that owneth a peculiar Juriſdiction; for that were indeed to yield the Cauſe: for the main thing in Diſpute is, whether one of the Presbyters hath Jurisdiction over the reſt. 2. It had been more ſuteable to the deſign and high pretenſes expreſſed in his Book, to confound us, and rout our Cauſe, with theſe manifeſt and palpable Evidences; than to tell us of them in general: *I* profeſs *I* have hitherto

ſeen

ſeen no ſuch Evidences in any of their Writings. 3. The Evidence that he mentioneth, the Angels in the Revelation, *&c.* are neither palpable nor manifeſt Proofs of ſuch Juriſdiction: he knoweth that all that hath by his Party been brought from theſe Topicks hath been Diſputed, and has, I judge, been abundantly anſwered: and that Sticklers for Paritie, both the learnedſt and the leſs learned, have rejected theſe Evidences, and denyed the Concluſion they were brought for: and *I* intend to debate them with him as they ſhall fall in. 4. That the *Catalogues of Biſhops* gathered in the midle of the ſecond Centurie, ſhould be a manifeſt and palpable Evidence for their peculiar Juriſdiction in the Apoſtolick age, is beyond my Comprehenſion: for the *Catalogues* do not determine what was their power; and theſe who made theſe Collections, are not ſo infallible that their Aſſertion ſhould be a manifeſt and palpable Evidence of the Truth of what they ſaid.

§ 9. That *nothing was ever done in Eccleſiaſtical Meetings, Canonically, without the Biſhops particular Advice, and Authority*; (as he argueth *p.* 29.) is of no force: becauſe firſt, we know not what he will call *Canonically* done: if he think nothing was *canonically* done without a *Dioceſan Biſhop*: this is to beg the Queſtion, and not to argue for his Concluſion. 2. If he mean that nothing was done in their Meetings without a Moderator, who preſided among them, and did, with the reſt, authoritatively Conſult and Determine; this we grant: but it maketh nothing for him. 3. What he meaneth by the Biſhops particular Advice and Authoritie, *I* cannot well gueſs. If he mean that he Adviſed and Determined with the reſt; that is what we hold. If, that he had a negative Vote; ſo that all the reſt could do nothing without his conſent, he ought not to call for Proof from us againſt that; the Probation is to be expected from him, who affirmeth it. If, that he determined by himſelf, and the reſt were but his Council, this we deny alſo, and he muſt prove it. *It* is enough, that we prove that others with the Biſhop, Moderator, or *Præſes*, did manage the Affairs of the Church: for which the Arguments above brought may be thought ſufficient. What followeth in ſeveral pages, is to prove, that the Jews and Grecians did ſometimes Dichotomize their Clergy, yet at other times they mentioned the Diſtinctions of the High Prieſt from other Prieſts: ſo of the Biſhops from the Presbyters. This would indeed weaken our Argument, if it had no more force than he giveth it; If we had argued ſimply from the Church Officers being ſometimes divided into Biſhops and Deacons, without diſtinguiſhing Biſhops, or

Presbyters

Presbyters among themselves. But our Argument being taken not only from this indistinction of Presbyters in some, but in all places where they are mentioned; and also from the Scripture not distinguishing them by their Offices, Work, Qualifications, or the Injunctions that are given them about their Work: these Distinctions of Presbyters that some of the Ancients use, make nothing against our Argument: unless he can prove that when they mean Bishops as distinct from Presbyters, they ascribe also a superior power to them, which he often asserteth, but never proveth. We confess that after the Apostles age, the name *Bishop* began soon to be appropriated to the *Præses* in the Presbyterie; but in the three first Centuries the Bishop did not rule alone, nor had superior power to the rest. I have lately defended against another of our Episcopal Brethren: and shall also endeavour it against the Assaults of this Author, when he shall please to attempt this proof. Mean while I am not concerned further to Answer what he insisteth on to *p.* 39. (where he engageth with another of our Arguments) than to examine some few *Hints* that seem to be intended as argumentative, wherewith his Discourse is interspersed.

§ 10. *He* telleth us *p.* 31. that *Cyprian asserts the Jurisdiction and Prerogative of the Episcopal power, upon all occasions, with great Courage and Assurance.* What my last Antagonist brought for this end, out of the Writing of that holy Martyr, I have endeavoured to Answer: with what success, it is not mine to judge; if this Author will either re-inforce the same Citations, or bring new ones, I shall not decline the Debate with him. That *Polycarp* (as he hath it, *p.* 32.) *distinguisheth himself from the subordinate Presbyters, while he inscribeth his Epistle, Polycarp, and the Presbyters that are with him. Who* (saith our Author) *if he had stood on a Level with these Presbyters, would never have distinguished himself from the Community of his Brethren.* This reasoning (I say) is so remote from Concludencie, that our Author hath not consulted his own Credite in using it. For first, whatever prioritie of Dignity may be hence inferred, as *Polycarp* being an older man than the rest, or *Præses* in the Meeting; it is ridiculous to infer from this, either Superiority, or solitude of power. 2. *Polycarp* might be the Author of the Epistle, and the rest Assenters to it; that might give occasion to his being named. 2. Will any say, that when a Letter is thus directed to a Presbyterie, for *N. Moderator, and the rest of the Brethren of the Presbyterie of E,* that this inferreth Episcopal Jurisdiction in the person of him who is so named?

Such ſtuff is not worth refuting. P. 33. He telleth us that *Hermas reproveth ſome who ſtrove for the firſt Dignity and Preferment: and if there was no ſuch Precedency then in the Church, there was no ground for his Reprehenſion. A page nugax.* Have not ſome ſtriven for unlawful Preferment, as *James* and *John* did for a Dominion in the Church, like that of the Lords among the Gentiles? Yea, we deny not all preferment in the Church: may not ſome ambitiouſly ſtrive to be a Miniſter, or an Elder, yea, or a Deacon? All which are Preferments, if compared with the people: and may not a Presbyterian Miniſter ſtrive to be Moderator, without deſigning Epiſcopal Juriſdiction. That *Blondel, Salmaſius and Daily, laboured to ſupport this Argument*, as our Author repreſents it is falſly aſſerted, *p.* 35. As is alſo, that *this Opinion* (about Parity *was never heard of before the days of Aerius.* If he would attempt to prove all that he confidently aſſerteth, his Book would ſwell to a great Bulk. Sir *Thomas Craig* (whoſe Memory is venerable in the learned World) muſt here alſo be laſhed, *as ignorant of Divinity, and of the Fathers*, becauſe he was prebyterianly inclined. I find nothing more that is obſervable, or that can derogate from the ſtrength of our Argument, as ſtated by us, in this his Diſcourſe: only his unmannerly, as well as falſe, Aſſertion, *p.* 38. that *the Eccleſiaſtical Levellers* (ſo in reproach and contempt he calleth the Presbyterians) *flie to this Argument as their firſt and laſt Refuge; and yet nothing is more frivolous and trifling.* He may ſee, if he will be at pains to read what he pretendeth to refute, that they have other, yea better Arguments: and will find it hard to give a ſolide Anſwer to this Argument, repreſented in its full Strength.

SECTION V.

Teſtimonies from Antiquity which my Antagoniſt pretendeth to wreſt from us Vindicated.

HE mentioneth theſe *p.* 9. as our third Argument for Parity. Whereas if he had thought fit to read what hath been written on our ſide, he might have found thrice as many more, and of more ſtrength than any thing that he maketh us to ſay. But this, and the two Arguments above debated with him, are all that he will allow us to have on our ſide. His Introduction to this piece of his Work ſmells rank of ſuch a temper of mind as I am not willing to name; while he cal-

leth

lish them who possessed the Government, and Revenues of the Church, *Atheists and Enthusiasts*; and that without exception or Limitation. Thus are all the Presbyterian and Congregational Ministers of *England* (as well as others) charactered by him. We will not retaliate; but the learned and religious world had, and have another Esteem of not a few who then were in the Ministry; and judge that Atheism, and other sinful Evils, have been diffused into the Church after that time; though we deny not that then it was too manifest among some. He saith that *Blondel employed all his Skill to make the Antients contradict themselves, and all contemporary Records.* This I pass as a piece of his usual and groundless Confidence. He saith, *when Blondel's Book appeared, the Presbyterians concluded (before ever they read it) that it was all pure and undenyable Demonstration.* And that *his Countreymen* (the Scots Presbyterians) *think they need no other Answer to what is written against them, but to say that Episcopacy, and all that can be found for it, is quite ruined by Blondel, and Salmasius*: and yet *that few of them read them.* It is not manly so to despise an Adversary whom one undertaketh to refute; neither is it Wisdom to spend so many hours, as he hath done, to argue the Case with them who are so despicable: nor is it Christian so to undervalue others whose Praises are in the Gospel; which I am sure may be said of some eminent Presbyterian Writers; who now having served their Generation, enjoy their Reward: but it is his way thus to supply what is wanting in the strength of his Arguments. I wonder who told him that the Presbyterians did so extoll *Blondel's* Book *before they read it*; or that few of them have read him, and *Salmasius*. Who of us ever said, that saying *Blondel* and *Salmasius* had ruined Episcopacy, was a sufficient Refutation of it? May not we, without such blame, commend the Works of these learned Men, as well as he *p.* 40. telleth us that *every Line of them is sufficiently exposed, and frequently*; and for this cryeth up the *Bishop of Chester*. He saith, *we shut our eyes against the clearest Evidences: that we think that* Blondel's *Book may barre all Disputation on that Head*: that *we refuse to enter into close Engagement with them.* These are a parcel of Words in which there is no Truth: and if we should Retort every Syllable of them on himself (I say not on his whole Party, among whom, I know, there are learned Men, who would be ashamed of this manner of pleading their Cause) how should this Contest be decided? Some who have spent more of their Years in Reading, than this Author hath done; and also have given better proof of it; have not so insult-

ed over their Adversaries, as men of no Reading. There is also little ground given for his insisting on this, as one of our main Arguments; for tho the Presbyterians will not part with the Suffrage of the Fathers, while the Controversie is about paritie of Church power, and the Jurisdiction of one Presbyter over the rest; yet they use oftner to act the defensive part, with respect to Antiquity, that is latter than the Canon of the Scripture: and which is of more weight, they never laid the stress of their Cause on Humane Testimony; but build their Opinion on the Sacred Writings. But seing he is pleased to lead us in this way, we are willing to engage with him (as *closly* as he will) on this Head: and to debate both on whose side the Fathers are, his or ours; and whether their Testimony be so convincing as he pretendeth it to be.

§ 2. Although I do much dislike my Antagonists rude Treatment of so great a man as *Blondel* was, saying that *he studyed to please the Independents, rather than the Presbeterians, because they were then more potent and numerous*; *r* so *p.* 42. *s* and calling his Arguments *childish Reasonings*: *p.* 43. Yet I do not undertake to make it appear, that every Testimony he bringeth from the Fathers is fully concludent, by it self. I observe also, that this Author, though he professeth to answer the Citations brought by *Blondel*, yet medleth but with a few of them, and these none of the most evident; except what *Blondel* bringeth out of *Jerom*: The first Testimony that he mentioneth is, the Inscription of *Clement's* Epistle to the *Corinthians*, written from *Rome*; which is, ἐκκλησία θεοῦ That is, *the Church of God dwelling in* Rome, *to the Church of God dwelling in* Corinth. *Blondel* hence concludeth, that there was no Bishop in either place, seing no notice is taken of him. To this our Authors answer is, *this would make for Independency, and that the Laity* (as he speaketh) *had an equal share in Jurisdiction with the Bishops and Presbyters.* And that *this would prove the equality of* Sosthenes, Timothy, *and* Sylvanus, *with* Paul; *because he sometimes joineth them with himself in the Inscription of some of his Epistles.* And that *it was the Humility of* Clement *that made him so write.* Answer 1. He misstaketh the Opinion of *Independents*: they have their Church Rulers, and do not put the Exercise of the Government in the hand of the Multitude: though, I confess, many of them give the people somewhat more than their due. 2. If this was an Epistle of a whole Church to a whole Church (as *Blondel* taketh it) there was no need of mentioning either Bishop, or Presbyters; and so equality of Jurisdiction of the people with them, cannot be hence inferred: but if

if it was an Epistle of a Bishop to a Church, where another Bishop governed, as this Author will have it: It is an unusual Stile not to mention the Bishop, at least of that Church to which the Epistle was directed: the Humility of *Clement* might make him not to distinguish himself from the people; but our Bishops would count it no Humility, but Rudeness, so to treat his brother Bishop at *Corinth*. 3. The Apostle *Paul* nameth some of the Pastors of the Church with himself, in the Inscriptions of some of his Epistles, as his fellow Pastors, who had joint, though not equal, Authority in the Church with him: but he never assumeth a whole Church into that Society with himself. By the Church, in both places, it may be rationally thought, *Clement* meant the teaching or ruling Church, or the Church representative; and in that case it might have been expected, if he were for Episcopacy, that the Bishop, at least in *Corinth*, should have had some peculiar mark of Honour: as when a Presbytery among us, is addressed, the Stile is, *to the Moderator, and the rest of the Brethren*, &c. though no special Jurisdiction be ascribed to the Moderator. But after all, I look on *Blondel*'s Observation on this Passage, as rather an Introduction to what he had further to say from this Epistle, and a cumulative Argument, than to be fully concludent by it self.

§ 3. Another Passage out of the same Epistle of *Clement*, brought by *Blondel*, our Author taketh a great deal of pains about, from p. 43. It so entangles him, that he cannot, with much strugling, get out of the Net. The words of *Clement*, cited by *Blondel*, are, Κατὰ χώρας οὖν κ. τ. λ. That is, *wherefore they* (the Apostles) *preaching through Countries and Cities, placed their first fruits, whom by the Spirit they had tryed, to be Bishops and Deacons for them who should believe: neither was it a new thing; for of old it had been written of Bishops and Deacons, I will make their Bishops in Righteousness, and their Deacons in Faithfulness.* From this Passage *Blondel* observeth first, that in *Clement*'s time there was Bishops in the Countrie, and in Villages, as well as in Cities. 2. That the City Bishops had no Authority over the *chorepiscopos* or Countrie Bishops. 3. That there were but two sorts of Church Officers, Bishops and Deacons; besides some other things which are not so much to our present design. Our Author, in his Answer, overlooketh the two former, which tend most to ruine his Cause (for the Bishops of that time could not be *Dioceses*, but Pastors of Congregations, if these two Observations hold, as they plainly follow from *Clement*'s words) and he insisteth only on the third,

third, the *Dichotomie* of the Clergy; which hath less probative in than the rest: yet it hath more strength in it, than his Answers are ble to enervate: which I now shall make appear. His Answer is, t *he hath already answered our Argument taken from the* Dichotomie *of Clergie.* Reply. Though we do not make that an Argument by it se in all cases where it is found; yet in some cases (and this in partic lar) it is concludent. *Clement* is here giving accout what Officers t Apostles settled in the Churches: and if they settled Bishops distin from Presbyters, and Deacons, this account is very lame, and usele His second Answer is *p.* 44, &c. *Clement, by Deacons, here understand all Ministers of Religion; whether Presbyters in the Modern notion, or Deac who, by the first Institution, were obliged to attend upon Tables? And so by B shops and Deacons, we may* (saith our Author) *understand Apostles, B shops, Presbyters, and Attendents upon Tables.* And then, at great length he proveth that which no body denyeth, that *the word Deacon, is used a great Latitude, for all sorts of Church Officers.* Reply. The Question is no how the word Deacon may be used in some cases, & on some occasion but what *Clement* here understandeth by it: I affirm, that it is absur to understand it here in that Latitude that our Author fancieth. Fo first, his meaning should be, the Apostles appointed in the Churche that they settled, Apostles, Bishops, Presbyters, and Attendents on Ta bles: so that every Church in every Village, must have its Apostl and Bishop too; beside inferior Officers. 2. If *Clement* had so meant it was superfluous to mention Bishops and Deacons too: it had been e nough to tell the *Corinthians*, that the Apostles settled Deacons; that i Officers in Churches; seing all sorts are signified by Deacons. 3. To say that Presbyters are to be understood by Deacons, rather than by Bi shops, is without all imaginable ground: the word *Presbyter* is as large used in Scripture, as that of *Deacon*: if we thus, at pleasure, expound Names, or rather Words, we may maintain what we will. 4. This *Dichotomy* being used on such a design, as to inform the people what were the ordinary Officers in the Church, by Apostolick Warrand, that they were to have regard to; it would not answer its end, if there were Bi shops whom they and the Presbyters must obey: for either they were to understand that the Presbyters were comprehended under the word *Bishops*; but then they had no Instruction about the Ruling Bishop, and the Teaching Bishop, as distinct, and how they should regard each of them; or under the word *Deacon*; and then they were at as great a loss,

loss what sort of Deacons he meant; whether the Rulers or Servants of the Church. 3. Though the word *Deacon*, be often applyed to any who serve God in publick Office in his Church, (yea, or in the State) yet that ever the Rulers, or Teachers of the Church are signified by it, when it is used distinctively from some other sort of Church Officers (as it is here) is more than I know.

§ 4. Another Answer he bringeth to this Passage of *Clement*, p. 46. that *Clement speaketh not of Ecclesiastical Policy, as it was at last perfected by the Apostles; but of the first beginnings of the Christian Church, immediately after the Resurrection of Christ.* *Reply.* If it be granted, that at first the Apostles settled Churches to be ruled by Presbyters, and served by Deacons, as this Answer seemeth to yield; they must let us know the Grounds on which they believe that the Apostles did alter this Policy, and set Bishops over the Churches that they had once thus settled: we find no Warrand in Scripture for this Conceit; though I know that some of our Prelatick Brethren affirm, that the Churches were governed by Presbyters, under the Inspection of the Apostles while they lived; but after their Death, Bishops were appointed to rule over them. We may rationally expect that they should give us good assurance for this Change; which yet I have not seen: if they will bring Arguments for it, we shall consider them. A 4th Answer he bringeth p. 47. that *Clement's words cannot bear such Parity as Presbyterians plead for; because he doth also Dichotomise the Jewish Clergy: among whom were the High Priest, Chief Priests, Priests, and Levites.* *Reply.* If *Clement*, when he so divides the Jewish Clergy, were on purpose instructing us how, and by whom the Affairs of the Jewish Church were managed, this Answer were pertinent: but if this Distinction be used occasionly, without this design, it is not at all to the purpose: in the one case Distinction is required; in the other case, it is enough to express the thing in general, and undistinguished terms. He bringeth yet a 5th Answer, p. 47, 48. That *Clement exhorting the Corinthians to Order and Harmony, setteth before them the beautiful Subordinations under the Temple Service; and immediatly recommends to them, that every one should continue ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι, in his own order.* *Reply.* If this Reasoning be at all significant, it will conclude, there must be a Pope, as well as Bishops, in the Christian Church: as there was a High Priest over all the Priests, and other Jews. We must then understand *Clement*, that there must be Order in the Christian Church, as well as in the Jewish Church; and every one must keep within

in the Station that God hath set him in: but it noways hence followeth, that there must be the same Degrees of Church Officers in the one that was in the other. What he citeth out of *Jerome*, *Ep. ad Ewang.* admitteth of the same Exposition; and is plain to be the whole that *Jerome* intendeth by these words, *quod* Aaron *& filii ejus atque Levitæ in Templo fuerunt, hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri vendicent in Ecclesia*: viz. That, as in the Temple, there was a Subordination of the Levites to *Aaron* and his Sons, so should the Deacon be to the Presbyter, whom *Jerome*, through that whole Epistle, proveth, to be the same with the Bishop. But it is like we may afterward hear more of this from our Author. A 6th Answer is *p.* 48, 49. (for this Citation galleth him sore, and maketh him look on all hands for Relief) *Clement himself distinguisheth the* ἡγούμενοι *from the* πρεσβύτεροι; *and the last may signifie Office and Age both together.* Reply. He no otherways distinguisheth them, than as the one word signifieth Office, or ruling Power; the other, the Age of them who use to be put into that Office: and though Presbyter is often used to signifie the Office; yet not when it is joined with, and distinguished from ἡγούμενοι. And it is clear, that in that place *Clement* is exhorting them to be subject to the Presbyters, as he had done several times in the Epistle; as they were ἡγούμενοι, Rulers, (not one, but more in the Church of *Corinth*) and as they were πρεσβύτεροι, elder in years: wherefore he exhorts young men to Sobriety.

§ 5. It is unaccountable Tergiversation, that this Author, pretending to examine some of the most remarkable Testimonies brought from Antiquity by *Blondel*, insisteth only on that which is of least weight; even in the Testimony already mentioned, as is above shewed: and likeways passeth over all the rest brought out of the same Fathers Writings, without so much as mentioning them. *Blondel* sheweth out of the Epistle of *Clement* already mentioned, that *Clement* telleth us, that *the Apostles knowing* per Dominum, *by Divine Revelation, that there would be Contentions about the Name of Bishop; therefore they appointed Presbyters and Deacons to manage the Affairs of the Church: so far were they* (saith Blondel) *from thinking Prelacy the best, or only Remedie against Schism; as some did in after ages.* He doth also shew, how *Clement* teacheth, that *the Presbyters* (or Bishops, for he often interchangeth these two Names as signifieing the same persons) *were set in the Church by the Apostles, and after by other excellent men* (so that the Apostles made no Change in the Government) *that they were placed with the consent of the whole Church* (not by the Bishop

and Patron) and he pleadeth that *such as had well done the work of a Bishop should not be turned out, for the holy Presbyters who have finished their Course, should fear no Change.* And after sheweth, how absurd it was that *the most ancient Church of Corinth* (it had then stood, as it is thought, about 25 years) *should move Sedition against her Presbyters*: some turbulent Spirits among them withstood, not a single Bishop (of whom not a word in all this Discourse) but the Presbyters of the Church: and he adviseth the Seditious rather to depart, that the Flock of Christ might enjoy Peace, μετα των καθιςαμενων πρεσβυτερων; *with the Presbyters that were settled in it*: it seems he did not name the Bishop, nor provided against Sedition against him; because he knew no such person at *Corinth*. And again he biddeth them *be subject to the Presbyters.* Now all this insisted on by *Blondel*, he passeth by (which was his wisdom) and insisteth only on the *Dichotomie* of the Clergy; which hath far less weight than these Passages have.

§ 6. He next taketh to Task what *Blondel* citeth out of *Polycarp*; which is, that writing to the Church of *Philippi*, *he taketh no notice of their Bishop*: that he biddeth them *be subject to the Presbyters and Deacons, not mentioning the Bishop, but a plurality of Presbyters which was in that one Church.* His Answer to all this is, first, that *Blondel himself taketh notice that Polycarp distinguisheth himself from the rest of the Presbyters, while he saith,* Polycarp *and the Presbyters that are with him to the Church in Philippi*: and that *by this he assumes a kind of Prelation above the rest of the Presbyters at Smyrna.* He fancieth that this is mighty uneasie to *Blondel*: but it had been more ingenious to tell us that *Blondel* brings this as an Objection against himself, and answereth it fully and easily, calling it *nuda Conjectura*, and giving several Reasons for *Polycarp*'s naming himself, from *his being the older man, and the older Minister.* And *being ordained by an Apostle* (which was a Dignity, though it gave no Superiority of Power) *as being better known to the Philippians*: and *Blondel* bringeth abundance of parallel Passages, where no Superiority of Power can be imported. All this our Author passeth over in silence. Next he saith, *this is still the Bipartite division of the Clergie*, which is a mistake; for here is Subjection required to Presbyters in Commune; which could not all be *Dioecesans*: and their Head, the Bishop, is not noticed: and his *Dichotomie* here is Argumentative; because (as was above shewed of *Clement*) he is telling them what Church Officers they should respect: where the Bishop was chiefly to be mentioned, if such a person had been in that Church. He will prove,

p. 51: that this can be no Argument for Parity. Because first, *Irenæus refutes the Heresies of the* Valentians, *from the unanimous Doctrine preserved among the single Successors of* Polycarp; *which could be no Argument, if the Ecclesiastical Power of the Church of* Smyrna *had been equally lodged in the Colledge of Presbyters.* I ask him, how doth the Parity of Church power weaken this Argument? Do not Ministers in any Church, succeed one to another, as well as Bishops? And if they be faithful, they will continue the true Doctrine, and hand it down to their Successors, as well as Bishops would do. Neither hath it any force, that single Successors are mentioned; for if there were more Flocks and Pastors in *Smyrna*, there was one Moderator in the Presbyterie; who is mentioned as more eminent, though having but equal power. If there was but one Pastor and many ruling Presbyters; he and his Successors did preserve the Truth by faithful Doctrine, not by Episcopal power. His other proof is, *the Epistles of* Ignatius *are zealously recommended in that Epistle of* Polycarp; *in which Episcopal Jurisdiction is asserted*: of which our Author will speak in due time. When he shall please to speak of *Ignatius*, we shall consider what he saith; and hope to find, that all the proof he can thence bring is insufficient. Mean while it is an odd way of arguing, an Author commendeth a Book, *Ergo*, he approveth all that is in it. If he had said *Polycarp* commendeth *Ignatius*'s Epistles, in that they assert Prelacy, that had been to the purpose; otherways his Inference is without all force.

§ 7. The next Father cited by *Blondel* is *Hermas*, in his Book called *Pastor*: on whom he layeth very little stress, as is evident to any who will read *Blondel*, without prejudice: and I think *Blondel* needed not to have mentioned him: both because he is of little Authority; it being most uncertain what *Hermas* was the Author of that Book; whether he mentioned *Rom.* 16. 14. or the brother of *Pius*: *Blondel* bringeth not a few Authors on both sides. Also this *Hermas* saith little either for or against Parity. I observe several things of my Antagonists conduct with respect to *Hermas*. 1. He pretendeth to bring *two palpable Evidences from him, that Episcopacy was the Ecclesiastical Government when that Book was written*: which he laboureth to prove p. 54. because *the sending circular Letters is insinuated to be the peculiar priviledge of* Clement, *then Bishop of* Rome. Answer. This Evidence (and the other will be found to be like it) is so far from being *palpable*, that it is not intelligible, how this (to a Protestant) should be an Evidence for Episcopacy: for first if it prove any thing to his purpose, it will prove the Papacy; *viz.* that

Clem-

Clement Bishop of *Rome* had Authority over all the Churches, and by that power might write Circular Letters to them. 2. Circular Letters may be written containing Advice or Information, where there is no Authority: and this was very proper for *Clement*, who resided in the Imperial City, which had Correspondence with all places in the Empire. The 2d *palpable Evidence* is, that *Hermas reproveth some who were ambitious to exalt themselves, & primam Cathedram habere*: whence he wisely inferreth; *If there be no Power, there can be no abuse of it.* To which I answer, I wish there were no Ambition but among the Prelatists. May not one who is a Presbyterian in his Profession, strive to set up Episcopacy, that he may be a Bishop? Was there Episcopacy in the Church of *Scotland anno* 1660, and 61, when ambitious Men laboured, and prevailed to make *a prima Cathedra*, that themselves might possess it? And might there not be such in the days of *Hermas*; as there appeared to be afterward, and as was in the Apostles times, when *Diotrephes* was marked as a φιλοπρωτεύων. 2. There is a *prima Cathedra* even among the Presbyterians; the Moderator's Chair, and there may be Ambition in seeking after even that pettie Preferment. The *Principatus* that he after mentioneth, may have the same signification: it doth not always signifie Authority; but often a Superior Dignity. The next thing I observe is, he neglecteth (as is customary with him) that which seemeth to have the most strength, among the Passages cited by *Blondel* out of *Hermas*; viz. Κλήμης πέμψει εἰς τὰς ἔξω πόλεις, σὺ δὲ ἀναγγελεῖς τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις τῆς ἐκκλησίας; which last words *Blondel* translated, *tu ante renunciabis Presbyteris Ecclesiæ. Biblioth: Patrum*, hath it thus, *Tu autem leges in hâc Civitate cum Presbyteris qui præsunt Ecclesiæ.* Either way it maketh more for the Parity of Presbyters, and their Power, in ruling the Church, than what else our Author hath thought fit to take notice of out of *Blondel*. The other Citation brought by *Blondel*, and so laboriously answered by our Author, I lay little weight on: only I observe his charging that learned Author with *a fraudulent Trick, p. 55. and distorting the words*; whereas the words, as cited by *Blondel*, and by him, are the very same.

§ 8. The Testimony of *Pius* Bishop of *Rome*, is next brought by *Blondel*, out of his Epistle to *Justus* Bishop of *Vienne*: where he telleth him, *Presbyteri & Diaconi non ut majorem*; *sed ut Ministrum Christi te observent.* My Antagonist taketh this only for an Exhortation to Humility. I know not whether his Superiors will think it inconsistent with Humility to be obeyed by their Presbyters; or if any of them will be so hum-

ble, as to disown all Majority with respect to the Presbyters: that *Humility* is here insinuated, we grant; but that no more is required, cannot be said without doing Violence to the words. I shall not contend whether this Epistle of *Pius* be legitime; or spurious; but I suppose it may be safely asserted, that if it was written by a Presbyterian, that Opinion is much older than this Author will allow. Another Argument *Blondel* bringeth from *Marcion*, being *rejected by the Presbyters at* Rome; *and not admitted to their Communion*: whence he inferreth, that the Church of *Rome* was then governed by Presbyters in common. Our Authors answer is *first*, *they denyed to receive* Marcion; *which is a better Precedent to regulate our Opinions and Practices by, than the Petition of a lewd and profligate Heretick.* Reply. If they had denyed on account of their want of Power without their Bishop, (for the *See* was then vacant) this Answer should have some sense: but they pretended no such thing; neither did they reprove him for his Address: if he had addressed to a single Presbyter to be received, he would surely told him that it was not in his power to Determine in that Matter: but when he addressed to a Colledge of Presbyters, they gave another Reason for their refusal; of which anone. He bringeth a second Answer, with his wonted Confidence: as if we were all *out of our Wits* who say not as he saith in this Matter: and indeed it hath need of this to strengthen it; for it is very weak of it self: it is, that *in the vacancy of the See, the Colledge of Presbyters might manage the ordinary Policy and Discipline of the Church; though they never medled with such special Acts of Jurisdiction as were always reserved, by constant Practice, and primitive Institution, to the Episcopal Order: though they might have received* Marcion *upon Repentance, in the vacancy of the See, I hope no man will thence conclude that they would have enterprised any thing of this nature and consequence, if their Bishop were alive, or if another were chosen in his room.* Reply. 1. Here the Question is manifestly begg'd: that there were reserved Acts peculiar to the Bishop, *by constant Practice, and primitive Institution*: the Practice is what we are debating: and such Institution we desire to be instructed in: we find it not in the Bible; which can be the only ground of that Divine Right we are now contending about. 2. As the Question is begg'd on the one hand, so he yieldeth it on the other, by owning Governing Authority in the Presbyters without a Bishop: if they have power, they have it from Christ, *Ergo*, he hath not given all Ruling Power to the Bishop, and made the Presbyters only his Council. Or let him shew us by what Rule

of

of the Gospel, Authority which they had not before, devolveth on the Presbyters when the Bishop dieth. This Government by Presbyters without a Bishop is not Episcopal Government, *Ergo*, it is not contrary to Divine Institution (by this Answer) if the Church be governed without Bishops, which is inconsistent with the Divine Right of that Government. 3. I know not what Act of Jurisdiction is higher than receiving or excluding, and casting out Church Members: wherefore if Presbyters have this, we must see some special Warrand from Scripture, before we can deny them another part of Church power. 4 That they would not have acted so without their Bishop, if he had been alive, is said without ground: if he had been absent they might have done it: as I have else where shewed, that the Presbyters at *Carthage* did in *Cyprian*'s retirement. If he could be with them it was irregular to act without him, as being their *Præses*; though having no majority of power. Before I pass from this Argument, I observe a greater strength in it, than *Blondel* hath mentioned, or my Antagonist hath attempted to answer: for clearing which, we must reflect on the History from which the Argument is drawn: which is *Marcion*, the Son of a Bishop in *Pontus*, for a lewd Act that he had committed (*ob illatum per summum nefas Virgini stuprum*) was driven away from the Communion of the Church, by his own Father; on which occasion he came to *Rome*, and attempted to be received into that Church: he was rejected by the Presbyterie; after which he preached his Errours in that City, and made great Disturbance. Now the Argument that we draw from this Passage is, not only that the Presbyterie did not reject his Petition as being incompetent Judges in that Case; but their Answer implyeth a Recognition of their power in this Matter: for they tell him, ὅτι οὐ δυνάμεθα, *we cannot do it without the permission of thy worthy Father* (nor this because of his Fathers Episcopal power, but) *because there is one Faith, and one Agreement*; *the Bond of Unity* between *Rome* and that Church in *Pontus* (I think its Name was *Sinope*) and was that which they gave as the reason of their Refusal: seing he was cast out of one Church, it was not reasonable that he should be received into another without her consent. *Romes* Headship was not then known. But what followeth is yet stronger for our Cause; ἢ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἐναντιοῦσθαι τῷ καλῷ συλλειτουργῷ σάτρι σοῦ: *we cannot go contrary to our excellent Collegue* (or Fellow Labourer) *thy Father*: where Presbyters look on a Bishop as their Collegue, and in no higher Degree; and that when they are speaking of the Exercise of Church Authority:

they

they plainly suppose, that they had the same power to take in, that he had to cast out: but they would not irregularly exerce that power, as they must have done if they had recived *Marcion*.

§ 9. Another of *Blondel*'s Citations, our Author answereth with a great deal of slighting and contempt; its taken out of *Justine Martyr*'s Apology for the Christians; where he giveth an account of the Church Order that was among the Christians; and mentioneth no Officer in the Church but *Præpositus & Diaconus*. His Answer to this is, *Justine*'s *design was only to vindicate the Christians from the Reproaches cast upon them about their Meetings; he had no occasion to speak of the Hierarchy: the Christians concealed their Mysteries as much as they could: and the Names of* Bishop *and* Presbyter *as well as their Offices, were known to the Heathen.* How to make the parts of this Answer hang together, I know not: if the Heathen knew their way, why did they conceal it? Neither is there any ground to think that they concealed their Mysteries, the Knowledge of which was the mean of convincing Heathens. Yea, the design of his Apology was to make their Mysteries known, that it might be seen how excellent they were. And to say that *Justine* had no occasion to speak of the Hierarchy here, is a mistake; for he did mention some of the Church Officers, and because he mentioned no more, it is like he knew no more. He seems now to be weary of his undertaking (and no wonder, it hath succeeded so ill with him) and therefore p. 60. he telleth us *how nauseous it is to repeat more*: and hudleth up some other Citations cited by *Blondel* in a general Answer; that *it is a silly Quible to found an Argument on* Dichotomies: and telleth us, *the Names, as well as the Offices, were distinguished in the earliest Monuments of the Church*, and for this he citeth *Usher*, mentioning *Acta Martyrii* S: *Ignatii*: but is not pleased to name Book, nor Page, of that learned Author; who hath written many things. The same he doth with *Clemens*, *Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, and *Origen*; but neither words nor place he mentioneth: such arguings are to be neglected. *Blondel* also citeth *Papias*, calling all the Ministers of the Word, *Apostles*, and others from whom he had learned what he wrote, *Elders or Presbyters*. This Author will have it to be meant of their Age, not Office. I lay not much weight on this Testimony, more than he doth. But that *Papias* doth not mean the Age only of them whom he mentioneth, may be gathered from what he saith of the second *John*, whom he mentioneth (for after he had named *John* among the Apostles, he nameth another, *John* after *Aristion*) and him he calleth

leth πρεσβύτερος. This cannot be meant of his Age, when he ſaith *John the elder*; for *John* the Apoſtle was older than he. It muſt then be underſtood of his Office. And *Euſeb. lib. 3. c. 35.* telleth us that there were two *Johns* buried at *Epheſus*, and that the Monuments of both remained in his time. Being now weary with arguing, and it ſeems fretted with what he could not well anſwer. He falleth to downright Railling, *p. 61.* he putteth on a Confidence beyond ordinary: this is the way of ſome when they are moſt at a loſs. This Conduct will not take with wiſe and conſidering Men. He telleth of the *unconquerableneſs of Prejudice* (in the Presbyterians no doubt; becauſe they will not yield to his Dictats, and what he looketh on as an Argument) and of their *miſerable Condition in reading the Ancients, with no other deſign than to diſtort their words.* Before he taxeth us for not reading them, now we read them, but with an ill deſign. I muſt tell him, it is too much for him, either to judge how we are employed in our Cloſets, and what Books we read, or what inward deſigns we have in our reading. We think he diſtorteth the words of the Ancients (we judge not his deſigns in reading them) he thinketh we diſtort them, let the Reader judge. Next he repreſenteth us as having *ſold our ſelves to the Intereſt of little Parties; and ſhut our Eyes againſt the expreſs Teſtimonies of theſe Fathers, whoſe broken Sentences we torture and abuſe, to ſupport Novelties*, and more of this Stuff; which it is not fit to anſwer, becauſe of the Wiſe Man's Advice, *Prov. 26: 4.*

§ 10. Now he will *p. 62.* have the Reader to make an Eſtimate of the *Presbyterian Candor* from two Inſtances. The firſt is, *Blondel* citeth the *Gallican Church* ſending *Irenæus* to *Rome*, and calling him a Presbyter, when he was Biſhop of *Lyons*. Our Author contendeth that he was not then Biſhop; and that *Photinus* his Predeceſſor, was not then dead. This piece of Chronology, though maintained by *Euſebius*, and *Jerome*, *Blondel* diſproveth, by many Authentick Records, as he thinketh. And now where is the want of Candor in this caſe? Is every man who after diligent ſearch into Hiſtory, doth miſtake in Chronology, about a Matter of Fact ſo diſingenious; and that to ſuch a Degree as this Author's Clamour would repreſent. This I ſay, ſuppoſing that *Blondel* doth miſtake in this Matter. I think it not worth the while to examine the large Diſcourſe he hath, and the manifold Citations to confirm his Opinion, finding that Debate ſomewhat Intricate (whether *Photinus* was then alive or not, when *Irenæus* was ſent to *Rome*, and

called

called a Presbyter) and the Matter of it is of no great Consequence. It seems our Author hath been at as little pains as I am at leasure now to take, about this Debate, but referreth you to Dr. *Pearson* for satisfaction; and yet he hath the confidence to charge so great a man as *Blondel* was, with *perplexed Conjectures*, and *affected Mistakes*: we think it neither Christian, nor Manly, nor Scholar like, so to treat the learned Men of his opposite Party. The other Instance, whereby he thinketh to prove *want of Candor*; yea *Impudence*, in the Presbyterians, is *p.* 63. that *we sometimes cite* Cyprian *on our side*; *and can name nothing plausibly, but that wretched Quible of the bipartite Division of the Clergy.* He thinks it *needless to bring Testimonies against us out of* Cyprian, *there are so many*: he calleth us also *Schismaticks*, and supposeth *that we have not read* Cyprian. Who can stand before such potent Ratiocinations? He referreth *the Vindicator of the Kirk* to a Book then expected. I suppose he meaneth *J. S. his Principles of the Cyprianick age*; which I saw long before I saw this Book of his: where indeed all that can be drawn from *Cyprian* (and much more) is carefully gathered together. And I refer him for satisfaction about *Cyprian*'s Opinion in the point of Church Government, to the Answer to that Book under the Title of the *Cyprianick Bishop examined*. In which Book I shall take this occasion to confess a Chronological Mistake, (this Author would have the Charity to call it the want of Candor, or what else he pleaseth to impute to his Adversary) it is *p.* 20, near the end, *Basil*, and *Optatus*, are said to live in the same Age with *Cyprian*; whereas they lived in the next Century: this was occasioned by an over hasty Glance into the Chronological Tables: I hope the Reader will pardon this Digression. Thus my Antagonist leaveth *Blondel* in quiet possession of the far greatest part, and most evident Testimonies, that he bringeth out of the Fathers for Parity: some will think he had better not begun this Work, than thus leave it imperfect; if others have answered all *Blondel*'s Citations, what he hath done was needless, if not, he doth his Work but by halves.

§ 11. I shall add some other Testimonies out of the Fathers; which our Author, at his leisure, may consider *Chrysost.* on 1 *Tim.* 3. asketh the Question, *why the Apostle passeth from giving Directions in, and about, the Qualifications of* Bishops, *immediatly to Deacons, omitting* Presbyters: and giveth this Answer, that *there is almost no difference between a* Bishop *and a* Presbyter: *and the care of the Church is committed also to* Presbyters, (which maketh it evident that *Chrysost.* did not think that Bishops ruled alone)

only

only he maketh the difference to be in *Ordination*; which he is ſo far from looking on as of Divine Inſtitution, that he maintaineth, ſaith *Durham*, that, *in the Apoſtles time, Presbyters ordained Biſhops.* This ſame Author on *Tit.* 1. *Homil.* 2. by the Elders whom *Titus* was to *ordain in every City*, underſtandeth Biſhops; *becauſe* (ſaith he) *he would not ſet one over the whole Iſland*: and after; *for a Teacher ſhould not be diverted by the Government of many Churches; but ſhould be taken up in ruling one*: where he maketh the Teacher and Ruler to be the ſame perſon: alſo aſſigneth but the Government of one Church to one man: both which are inconſiſtent with Dioceſan Epiſcopacy. *Ambroſi in Tim.* 3. 9. hath this Paſſage; *qui tanta cura Diaconos eligendos præcepit, quos conſtat eſſe miniſtros Sacerdotum; quales vult eſſe Epiſcopos, niſi, ſicut ipſe ait, irreprehenſibiles*: where he plainly ſuppoſeth all the Church Officers, who are not Deacons, to be Biſhops: and a little after, *Poſt Epiſcopum tamen Diaconatus ordinationem ſubjecit, quare? niſi quia Epiſcopi & Presbyteri una ordinatio eſt; uterque enim Sacerdos eſt; Epiſcopus tamen primus eſt; ut omnis Epiſcopus Presbyter ſit, non tamen omnis Presbyter Epiſcopus; hic enim eſt Epiſcopus, qui inter Presbyteros primus eſt*: *Denique Timotheum Presbyterum ordinatum ſignificat; ſed quia ante ſe priorem non habebat, Epiſcopus erat.* All this ſeemeth to be a Deſcription of a Presbyterian Moderator: for he giveth the Biſhop no Prelation but that of Precedency, or Priority, to a Presbyter: and that, not by a new Ordination, which ſhould give him a ſuperior power; but a Seniority, or Priority of Ordination, which was the way of a Moderator's being ſet up at firſt; but was after changed into Election; when it was found, that ſometimes, the oldeſt man was not the fitteſt man for that Work. From all this, it is clear, that in the time of *Ambroſe* (which was in the fourth Century) Majority of Power in a Biſhop above a Presbyter, was not lookt on as *Juris Divini*; nor that a Biſhop muſt have (after he is ordained a Presbyter) a new Ordination, or Conſecration; whereby he getteth Juriſdiction over his fellow Presbyters, and their Flocks: I do not deny but that *Ambroſe* doth, in ſome things, miſtake the primitive Order of the Church: and miſunderſtand the Scripture account that is given of it, wherefore he ingeniouſly confeſſeth on *Epheſians* 4. 11. thus, *ideo non per omnia conveniunt ſcripta Apoſtolica ordinationi quæ nunc eſt in Eccleſia*: yet he giveth ground to think, that even then, the Diſtinction between Biſhop and Presbyter was not arrived at a Majority of Power, or ſole Juriſdiction. I obſerve here alſo, *obiter*, that *ordinatio*, in the primitive times, did not always

ways signifie authoritative setting apart one for a Church Office; which our Author else where doth with much zeal plead. If the Reader please to add to these, all the Testimonies cited by *Blondel* (which our Author thought not fit to medle with) he may see abundant cause to think, that our Opinion about Paritie is not so *Novel*, as this *Enquirer* fancieth it to be. Though I lay little weight on the Opinions of the School-men, in the controverted Points of Divinity; and especially, in the Point of Church Government: yet considering, that they owned the *Roman Hierarchy*, a Testimony from them, or other Papists, seemeth to be a Confession of an Adversary, extorted by the force of Truth. *Lombard. lib.* 4. *Sententiar. dist.* 4. after he had asserted seven Orders of the Clergy, when he cometh to speak of Presbyters, *p.* 451. *Edit. Lovan.* 1567, *apud veteres* (saith he) *idem Episcopi & Presbyteri fuerunt, &* *p.* 452. *cumque omnes* (*nempe septem ordines Cleri*) *spirituales sunt & sacri, excellenter tamen Canones, duos tantum sacros Ordines appellari censent; nempe Diaconatus & Presbyteratus; quia hos solos primativa Ecclesia legitur habuisse; & de his solum præceptum Apostoli habemus.* *Cajetan*, on *Titus* 1. 7. hath these words; *ubi adverte, eundem gradum, idemque officium, significari à Paulo nomine Episcopi & nomine Presbyteri; nam præmisit, idcirco reliqui te in Creta, ut constituas Presbyteros; & modo, probando regulam, dicit oportet enim Episcopum, &c.* Estius, *lib.* 4. *Sententiar. dist.* 24. when he is proving Episcopal Jurisdiction above a Presbyter, doth not refer it to Divine Right: *quod autem* (saith he) *Jure Divino Episcopi sint Presbyteris superiores, & si non ita clarum est è sacris literis, &c.* And he proveth it by the Authority of some Popes, and Councils. As also *Lombard.* ubi *supra*, fetcheth the Original of the several Degrees of Bishops from the Heathen *Flamins*, *Archi-flamines*, and *Proto-flamines*; not from Scripture. *Bellarm.* citeth *Medin.* condemning *Jerome* as erroneously holding the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter: this *Bellarm.* hath *lib.* 1. *c.* 15. *de Clericis*: *Object.* 6. *Medina* doth there affirm, *August. Ambros. Sedul. Primasius, Chrysost. Theodorat. Œcumen.* and *Theophylact.* to be of the same mind: and he addeth, *atque ita illi viri alioqui sanctissimi, & sacrarum literarum consultissimi; quorum tamen sententiam prius in Aerio, deinde in Waldensibus, postremo in Wiclefo damnavit Ecclesia, &c.* It is here evident that others as well as the *Scots Presbyterians*, held the Opinion about Parity to be no *Novelrie*. Also *Sixtus Senens. Biblioth. Sanct. lib.* 6. *Annotatio.* 324. looketh on *Jeromes* Opinion as being for the Identitie of Bishop and Presbyter; and citeth as agreeing with him, *Ambros. Chrysost.*
Sedul.

Sedul: Anselm: Thom: Valdens: against *Wiclife*: who refuteth him as being of *Jeromes* Opinion in this: and of *Alfonsus Castrensis* he saith, *non veretur fateri Hieronimum hâc in parte errasse*: to these *Schoolmen* I shall add some of the *Canonists*, as plainly against this *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy. *Gratian: dist: 60. cap: ult. Ad verbum Papa; sacros ordines dicimus Diaconatum & Presbyteratum: hos quidem solos primitiva Ecclesia habuisse dicitur. Joan: Semeca: Gloss: in Jur: Can: dist: 95. Dicunt quidem quod in Ecclesia prima primitiva commune erat Officium Episcoporum & Presbyterorum, & nomina erant communia.* Ibid. c. olim. *Et officium erat commune: sed in secunda primitiva cœperunt distingui & nomen & officia.* So *Owen of ordination p.* 108. who also citeth to the same purpose, *Concil: Aquisgr: can:* 8 *Concil Hispal. c.* 2. *Canon.* 7. and *Concil. Constantiens.* where Presbyters were determined to have decisive voices with Bishops; because in the Law of God Bishops were no more than Presbyters. I am far from inferring from what hath been said, that all these were Presbyterians. But it is evident that some of them did not hold Episcopacy to be *Juris Divini*, as this *Enquirer* doth: and that none of them lookt on Paritie as so late an Invention as he doth.

SECTION VI.

His Answers to our Citations from Jerome *and* Augustine, *examined.*

THis learned Author hath singled out the Testimonies brought by Presbyterians out of these two Fathers, and promiseth *p.* 65, to *examine them more narrowly, as being the chief strength of the Presbyterians, that is to be found in the Writings of the Ancients.* I shall adventure to examine his Examination. He taxeth *Blondel* for inscribing his Book, *Apologia pro Sententia Hieronimi, as if the Presbyterians Doctrine had been certainly espoused by Jerome*; and bringeth this Argument against this Conduct of *Blondel*. *At this rate* (saith he) *his Contemporaries were very much to be blamed who placed* Aerius *among the Hereticks, and yet on all occasions make honourable mention of* Jerome, *if he taught the same Doctrine for which* Aerius *was condemned for a Heretick.* This reasoning is of no weight: for it is well known on how small grounds some in the fourth or fifth Centuries were listed among the Hereticks. 2. It is no rare thing in the World, to heighten the same Action, or Opinion in one person, which they excuse or extenuate in another: We know how the Pope

condemneth the ſame Principles as Hereſie in *Calvine*, which he paſſeth no ſuch Cenſure on when they are taught by the *Janſeniſts*: and how *Alvarez* chargeth *Calvine* with Hereſie, for the ſame things that he himſelf holdeth: and is at much pains to ſhew the difference, where indeed there is none. *Jerome* was a man of great eſteem, ſo as it ſeems *Aerius* was not. 3. It is thought by many, that *Aerius* managed his Principle more unpeaceably than *Jerome* did: that he oppoſed himſelf more fiercely to the growing Uſurpations of that time; and made a Schiſm about the Matter. And it is evident that many of them who are by *Epiphanius* called Hereticks, were at moſt, but Schiſmaticks. Neither do I by this yield, that Presbyterians now may be called Schiſmaticks; for I know not that *Aerius* was juſtly ſo branded, on account of that Opinion. Nor do I think that Epiſcopacy was come to that intollerable height when *Aerius* oppoſed it, that it is come to in our days, and came too ſoon after his time. 4. *Magdeburg. cent.* 4. *c.* 5. *p.* 399, 400. *edit. Baſil.* 1560. ſheweth that *Epiphanius* maketh him an *Arian*. So *Auguſt.* and *Baſil.* ſay he was the Author of the Hereſie of the *Syllabici*; which was indeed *Arianiſm*: from which *Magdeb* concludes, that we have little certainty about him. 5. Some men of great worth excuſe *Aerius*: as *Whitaker*, *Reinolds*: and affirm, that he was innocent of theſe Hereſies they charge him with, only he had angered ſome great men of the Age; by queſtioning ſome of their Uſurpations; and alſo by zealouſly oppoſing ſome of the Superſtitions that were then creeping into the Church; and had too much Countenance from ſome eminent Men: ſuch as Praying, and offering for the dead, and Praying to Saints. 6. *Aerius* was not eſteemed a Heretick by all the Fathers of that, or the following Age: none call him ſo but *Epiphanius*; and *Auguſtine*, who implicitely took it from *Epiphanius*. Neither *Theodoret*, nor *Socrates* nor *Sozomen*, nor *Evagrius*, have any thing of the *Aerian Hereſie*.

§ 2. He maketh a Collection of the Citations we bring out of *Jerome*, and then giveth us his Remarks on them. I muſt alſo tranſcribe them, that the Reader may have them before him, while he is upon this Debate about them. The firſt is out of *Hieron*: on *Tit.* 1. *Diligenter* (ſaith *Jerome*) *Apoſtoli verba attendamus, dicentis, ut conſtituas per Civitates Presbyteros, ſicut ego diſpoſui; qui qualis Presbyter debeat ordinari, in ſequentibus diſſerens, hoc ait, ſi quis eſt ſine crimine, unius uxoris vir, &c. Poſtea intulit, oportet enim Epiſcopum ſine crimine eſſe tanquam Dei diſpenſator: idem eſt ergo Presbyter qui & Epiſcopus; & antequam Diaboli inſtinctu ſtudia*

studia in religione sterent; & diceretur in populis, ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cephæ; communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesia gubernabatur. Postquam vero unusquisque quos baptizaverat suos putavit esse, non Christi: in toto orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus, superponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertineret, & Schismatum semina tollerentur. Of what followeth in *Jerome* the *Enquirer* giveth but a lame account; telling us that *Jerome* proveth the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter from *Phil.* 1. *Acts* 20. 1 *Pet.* and Epistle to the *Hebrews*. But I shall give a more full account of his words; He addeth to what goeth before, *putet aliquis non scripturarum sed nostram esse sententiam, Episcopum & Presbyterum unum esse, & alind ætatis, alind esse nomen Officii; relegat Apostoli verba ad Philipp: dicentis, Paulus omnibus sanctis in Christo Jesu qui sunt Philippis, cum Episcopis & Diaconis: Philippi* (these are *Jerome*'s words) *una est urbs Macedoniæ, & certe in una civitate plures* (*ut nuncupantur*) *Episcopi esse non poterant; sed quia eosdem Episcopos illo tempore, quos & Presbyteros appellabant, propterea indifferenter de Episcopis quasi de Presbyteris est locutus. Adhuc alicui hoc videretur ambiguum, nisi altero testimonio comprobetur, in Actis Apostolorum scriptum est, quod cum venisset Apostolus Miletum, miserit Ephesum, & vocaverit Presbyteros Ecclesiæ ejusdem; quibus postea inter cætera sic locutus, attendite vobis & omni Gregi in quo Spiritus Sanctus vos posuit Episcopos, &c. Et hic diligentius observate, quomodo unius civitatis, Ephes. Presbyteros vocans, postea eosdem Episcopos dixerit. Si quis vult recipere eam Epistolam quæ sub nomine Pauli ad Hebræos scripta est,* (for that Epistle in *Jerome*'s days was controverted, whether it were canonical Scripture or not) *& ibi, æqualiter, inter plures, Ecclesiæ cura dividitur, siquidem ad plebem scribit, parete principibus vestris* (behold, *Jerome* calleth the Presbyters, *principes*, from their ruling power; from which Title given to Bishops, our Brethren often argue for their sole Jurisdiction) *& subjecti estote, &c. Et Petrus, qui ex fidei firmitate nomen accepit, in Epistola sua loquitur, dicens,*

dicens, Presbyteros ergo in vobis obsecro, compresbyter, &c. pascite gregem Domini, &c. Hac propterea ut ostenderemus (this our Author citeth) *apud veteres eosdem fuisse Presbyteros, quos & Episcopos; paulatim vero* (*ut dissentionum plantaria evellerentur*) *ad unum sollicitudinem esse delatam. Sicut ergo Presbyteri sciunt se ex Ecclesiæ consuetudine, ei qui sibi præpositus est esse subjectos, ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispensationis Divinæ veritatis Presbyteris esse majores; & in commune debere Ecclesiam regere: imitantes Mosen; qui cum haberet solus præesse populo Israel, 70 elegit, cum quibus populum judicaret: videamus igitur qualis Presbyter sive Episcopus ordinandus sit.*

§ 3. He bringeth also *Jeromes* Epistle to *Oceanus*, where I confess I find nothing for our purpose, but what is more fully and clearly said by *Jerome* in the place cited; and which followeth. Next he bringeth *Jerome's* Epistle to *Euagrius*, (which is next to that to *Oceanus*) in which he citeth the same Scriptures; but to them he prefixeth (which this Author passeth over) *audio quendam in tantam erupisse verecundiam, ut Diaconos Presbyteris i. e. Episcopis, præferret: nam cum Apostolus perspicuè doceat, eosdem esse Episcopos quos Presbyteros, quis patitur ut mensarum & viduarum Minister supra eos se tumidus efferat, ad quorum preces Christi corpus sanguisque conficitur. Quæris autoritatem, audi testimonium*; and so he citeth *Phil.* 1. and *Acts* 20. And then, *ac ne quis contentiose in una Ecclesia plures Episcopos fuisse contendat; Audi & aliud testimonium, in quo manifestissime declaratur, vel comprobatur, eundem esse Episcopum aut Presbyterum*: and so he citeth *Tit.* 1. and also 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. where *Timothy* is said to be ordained by *laying on of the Hands of the Presbyterie*: and 1 *Pet.* 5. and taketh notice of the Emphasis of the Charge given to Presbyters in the Word ἐπισκοποῦντες, *unde*, (saith he) *& nomen Episcopi est tractum*: and then he citeth *Jah. Ep.* 2. and 3. where that Apostle calleth himself Presbyter, or Elder. After all this, the words that the *Enquirer* citeth, do follow. *Quod autem postea unus electus est qui cæteris præponeretur, in Schismatis remedium factum est, ne unusquisque*

Ecclesiam

Ecclesiam ad se trahens, Christi Ecclesiam rumperet. Nam & Alexandriæ à Marco Evangelista, usque ad Heraclam, & Dionysium Episcopas, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collatum, Episcopum nominabant. Quomodo si exercitus imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint, & Archi-Diaconum vocent. Quid enim facit Episcopus, excepta ordinatione, quod Presbyter non facit: nec altera Romana urbis Ecclesia, altera totius orbis æstimanda est; & Gallia, & Britannia, & Oriens, & Persis, & Judæa, omnes barbaræ nationes, unum Christum adorant, unam observant regulam veritatis: Si authoritas quæritur, orbis major est urbe. Ubicunque fuerit Episcopus sive Romæ, sive Eugubii, sive Constantinopoli, sive Rhegii, sive Alexandriæ, sive Thanis, ejusdem meriti est, ejusdemque Sacerdotii: potentia divitiarum & paupertatis humilitas, vel superiorem vel inferiorem Episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes Apostoli successores sunt. After this he proposeth an Objection against himself, from the practice that then was at *Rome*, that a Presbyter *ordinabatur ad testimonium Diaconi*: which seemeth to make for the preference of a Deacon before a Presbyter: which is that he opposeth through that whole Epistle; and having answered that Objection, and condemned that Practice, he proceedeth thus, *sciant quæ constituti Diaconi; legant acta Apostolorum: recordentur conditionis suæ Presbyter & Episcopus: aliud ætatis, aliud dignitatis nomen est: unde ad Tit. & ad Tim: de ordinatione Episcopi & Diaconi dicitur, de Presbyteris omnino reticetur, quia in Episcopo & Presbyter continetur. Qui promovetur de minori, ad majorem provehitur. Aut igitur ex Presbytero ordinetur Diaconus, ut* (not *aut* as our Author saith) *Presbyter minor Diacono comprobetur, in quem crescat ex parvo: aut si ex Diacono ordinetur Presbyter, noverit se lucris minorem Sacerdotio esse majorem. Et ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento; quod Aaron & filii ejus, & Levita fuerant in Templo, hoc sibi Episcopi & Presbyteri & Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia.* There is yet another place of *Jerome* which this Author hath not mentioned (I shall not say he hath not read *Jerome*, though he cite him;

which he imputeth to these on our side, on less occasion given) it is Ep: *ad Heliodor: Tract: 3. tertiæ partis, fol.* (*mihi*) 284, 285. This person being *Jerome's* intimate Friend, it seems was averse from an Eremetical Life, and desired rather to be in the Ministry. *Jerome* taketh much pains in this Epistle, to perswade him to go to the Desert, and there serve Christ; and having occasion to speak of the Clergy, he saith of them, without Distinction; *absit autem ut quicquam de his sinistrum loquar; qui Apostolico gradui succedentes; Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt: per quos & nos Christiani sumus: qui claves regni cœlorum habentes, quodammodo judicii diem indicant. Qui sponsam Dei sobria castitate conservant.* And a little after, *mihi ante Presbyterum sedere non licet* (it seems neither he, nor *Heliodorus* were then ordained, though they both were afterward) *Et si peccavero, licet tradere me Satanæ, in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus sit in die Domini Jesu.*

§ 4. Let us now see how my Antagonist answereth what he thought fit to cite out of *Jerome*. To which I premise that our present Debate is not whether what *Jerome* writeth be true or false, sound or unsound, but what was *Jerome's* Opinion in the Matter now controverted; and consequently whether *Jerome* be on our side, or on the opposite side. I observe also that our Author denyeth not that *Jerome* thought there was a time when the Church was governed *communi Presbyterorum consilio*. But he thinketh *Jerome* mistook in this, and in that Period (which he taketh to be in the Apostles time, before Bishops were setled in the Churches) the Apostles governed the Churches which they had planted, by their personal and Apostolical Authoritie. *I* must examine this before *I* proceed. *It* is not to be denyed, that when the Apostles, by their preaching, had converted a Company of people to Christianity, while they were not formed into Societies, and had no Officers to teach and govern them, they managed the Affairs of these people, by their own Authority; and it could not be otherwise. But here are three mistakes. 1. That the Apostles first setled Teaching Presbyters in these newly converted Churches, who might teach them, but not rule them: and afterward set Bishops over them to rule them: this is a groundless Fancie, nor can any shadow of Authoritie be given from Scripture for it: if he shall offer any thing as a proof of this, we shall consider it. We think that the Apostles setled Presbyters among the new converted Societies, both for teaching them, and ruling them; and that the Apostles gave these Elders Direction, by the infallible Spirit, both what they should

ſhould teach, and how they ſhould govern: the latter needeth no proof; the former we prove from *Acts* 14. 23. *Tit.* 1. 5. where we read of ordaining Elders κατ' ἐκκλησιαν, and κατὰ πόλιν; and the other Scriptures above cited *Sect.* 3. § 12, 14. by which it is made appear, that theſe Elders ruled the Church, as well as inſtructed her, as at *Corinth*, and at *Theſſalonica*, and elſe where. Another miſtake is, that the Apoſtles by themſelves governed any particular Churches that were ſetled, and had Presbyters among them. The contrary is evident from what hath been proved of the Elders governing the Churches: and from this, that our Adverſaries can produce no ſuch Inſtance. *Paul* had indeed the care of all the Churches on him, whether they had Officers or none: but it doth not thence follow, that he ruled them all, or any of them, perſonally: his care was that they might be well taught and well ruled, by them who were appointed to that Work; over all whom he, and every one of the Apoſtles, had a *Superintendency*. A third miſtake is, that the Apoſtles in their time, made a change of the Government that they had ſetled in the Church; by ſetting up Biſhops, where formerly they had ſetled Teaching Presbyters, and had ruled the Churches themſelves: and particularly that at *Corinth* upon the Diviſions mentioned 1. Ep. *Ch.* 3. a Biſhop was ſet up there, as this Author hinteth, *p.* 69. Can he, or any man elſe, give any thing that looketh like a Warrant for this Imagination? Surely if ſuch a Change had been made by the Apoſtles, we ſhould have had ſome hint of it in their Writings, or in the Hiſtory of their Acts.

§ 5. This Author hath an other obſerve, in the ſame page, as wilde, and wide from the Truth: that *Jerome* thought that the *Superintendency* of Biſhops above Presbyters, was occaſioned by the Contentions at *Corinth*; ſo he thought that this Remedy of Schiſm, was appointed by the Apoſtles themſelves; and that it was not the Invention of after Ages: but the Apoſtles by their own experiance immediatly found the *Inconveniency* of Paritie; and therefore appointed, that *unus præponeretur cæteris*. This is ſtrange Confidence, and little Evidence of that Candor which he ſo much deſiderateth in *Blondel*, and other Presbyterians. Can he produce any Word, or Paſſage in *Jerome*, from which this may be inferred? Yes, he pretendeth to prove it: after he hath ſtated this as the preſent Debate, *whether it was* Jerome's *Opinion that the Apoſtles themſelves ſet up Epiſcopacy as the Remedy of Schiſm; or that Parity continued ſometime after the Apoſtles; and the Church in after Ages ſet up Prelacy, becauſe Parity was*

ops to breed Schism. The former he maintaineth, we hold the latter. That *Blondel* saw, that *Jerome* thought that the Apostles turned the Government from Paritie to Prelacy, is a strange Assertion, when the great design of his Book was to prove the contrary. And the proof of it is yet stranger; *Blondel entereth a Caveat, that none should think that the Apostles themselves appointed the Remedy of Schism mentioned by Jerome.* Is it not a good Consequence? This is an absurd Thought, saith *Blondel*, ergo, I believe it was *Jerome's* Opinion. *Blondel* maintaineth, and so do I, that not only it is not true that the Apostles in their time appointed the Remedie; but that *Jerome* was not of that Opinion.

§ 6. His first proof, that such was *Jerome's* Opinion, is *p.* 7. Jerome *thought that the occasion of the change that was introduced into the Ecclesiastick Government, were the Disputes in the Church of* Corinth; *and therefore the change made must needs be Apostolical: they only had power to erect the Ecclesiastick Fabrick, and they were zealous to prevent Confusions. No other Decree could be meant by* Jerome's toto Orbe decretum est, *for no other Decree could oblige all, nor would have been so universally received: neither was there any Council that had so decreed. This Apostolical Constitution* Jerome *calleth in his Commentaries on* Titus, consuetudo Ecclesiæ; *which he distinguisheth from* dispositio Divinæ veritatis, *meaning that the Prelacy of one Priest above many, was introduced rather by Apostolical practice, than the personal mandate of our Blessed Saviour.* Such Discourse from a Presbyterian, would be exposed by this Author, with great scorn: but I shall shew the absurdetie of it by Reason. 1. That *Jerome* did not say, nor mean, that the Apostles made this change in Church Government, is manifest. For 1. He saith it was done *paulatim*; whereas *apud veteres idem fuerit Presbyteri qui & Episcopi*: so on *Phil.* 1. as we cited § 2. These *veteres* cannot be the Apostles; but they who lived in the first Ages after the Apostles are so called; but whatever he in that; an Apostolick Decree for Bishops, and bringing them in, *paulatim*, do not well agree. It is here plain, that *Jerome* thought, in the first Ages after the Apostles, the Church was governed *communi Presbyterorum consilio*: but Schism arising in process of time, like that in *Corinth*, while the Apostles lived; the Paritie was by degrees and first in some Churches, after in others, turned into a Prelacy. Certainly if the Apostles in their Life-time, had made a Decree for Prelacy, all the Churches would presently have set up that way, in its due Height, and not brought it in *paulatim*. 2. The very design of *Jerome*, in the places cited, which he laboriously prosecuteth

is to prove, by Testimonies of the Apostles, that Bishop and Presbyter are one: how is this consistent with his thinking that the Apostles decreed the contrary? this were to make the learned *Jerome* to speak, yea to think, the most palpable contradictions. 3. Is it imaginable, if *Jerome* had thought that the Apostles first for a time setled Paritie, and then by degrees (or otherwise) changed it into Prelacy, that he would be at so much pains to tell us where the Apostles did the former, as in all the places he citeth: and yet not point to one place in all their Writings, where this Decree for a Change should be found? He may believe what he will, who can be perswaded of this? If *Jerome* had thought that the Apostles then decreed Prelacy when the Debates arose at *Corinth*; and that it was done on occasion of these Debates, and as a Remedie of them, he had been very absurd, and pleased himself with a groundless Fancy: for when the Apostle was reproving these Schisms, and labouring to cure them, and prevent the like among Christians, he hath not one word of Prelacy as a remedie of them: but on the contrary, reproveth the Presbyters of that Church, for being defective in the exercise of their Church power, *cap.* 5. of that same Epistle; and *cap.* 12.28. telleth them what Officers were to continue in the Gospel Church, and no mention of Bishops among them.

§ 7. Another thing in this Answer is most absurd; that he calleth this Apostolical Decree, *consuetudo Ecclesiæ*: a Decree and a Custome are two different things; nor was it ever heard of (till this new Master of words arose) that a Decree was so called: Custome may follow on a Decree; and the same thing may be decreed which hath antecedently obtained by a Custome; but to say a thing (*ex gra*: the setting up of Bishops as the remedie of Schism) had its Original from Custome, and to mean it had its Rise from a Decree, is to speak *non sense*: which no wise man will impute to that learned Father. Wherefore it is evident that *Jerome*, by *consuetudo Ecclesiæ*, meaneth the practice of the Church after the Apostles (for to say it was the practice in their time, is inconsistent with what he confesseth to be *Jerome*'s Opinion, that the Church was then governed by Presbyters) which came in by degrees, *paulatim*. 3. It is an unaccountable Absurditie, to make an Apostolical Decree, or Practice, so opposite to *dispositio Dominicæ veritatis*, as are Parity and Prelacy. Were not the Apostles guided by the Spirit of Christ? Is it then imaginable, that He appointed Parity, or did not appoint Prelacy; and the Apostles finding Parity inconvenient, would appoint Prelacy. Nei-

ther could *Jerome* mean, that Bishops were not appointed by any Command given out personally by Christ while he was on earth; but by the Apostles after his Ascension: for that had been impertinent, and nothing to his purpose. For what different influence could that have on Bishops, to keep them from undue exalting themselves above the Presbyters (which is manifestly *Jerome*'s Scope in these words) whether they were instituted by a personal Command of Christ; or by his Apostles guided by his infallible Spirit; for the Sense would be, Bishops are not above Presbyters by Christ's appointment; but they are above them by the Apostles appointment; which either sets these two Appointments in opposition the one to the other, or maketh the words to be ridiculous and absurd. 4. That the Apostles only *had power to erect the Ecclesiastick Fabrick*, and that there was no other obliging Decree at that time, is true, but it doth not hence follow, that *Jerome*'s *toto orbe decretum est*, is meant of such an Apostolick Decree. It is rather meant of a Resolution (*decretum est* doth not always signifie an authoritative Sentence passed through the several Churches, in most parts of the World (so *toto orbe*, may well be restricted) to set up a constant *Praeses*, whom they particularly called the Bishop. The Phrase *toto orbe decretum est*, cannot be understood of a Decree made in one place (as that of the Apostles must be) though for the whole World; but of what was done in the several places of the World.

§ 8. That *Jerome* only alludeth to the Divisions at *Corinth*, and did not look on them as the immediate occasion of the Change that was made, I further prove. 1. The Schisms that *Jerome* speaketh of, as introducing the Change, were made by the Presbyters; who had baptized the people, and every one set up a Faction with these whom he had baptized: his words are plain; *postquam autem unusquisque quos baptizaverat suos putavit esse, non Christi, toto orbe decretum est, &c.* Now the Divisions at *Corinth* were among the people, not among the Pastors. I hope he will not say that *Paul*, *Apollos*, and *Cephas*, fell out about dividing the people among them, as their Followers disagreed. Wherefore *Jerome* could not mean this Schism, though he allude to it. 2. It is not to be imputed to the Apostles that they would settle one Church Order, and so quickly change it into another, as they must have done, if the change were on occasion of the Schism at *Corinth*, which fell out soon after the setling of that Church; and while other Churches were not yet setled. They no doubt foresaw the Divisions that would be, and did

did, at the first settlement of Churches, provide what Remedie the Holy Ghost thought fit for that Church disease. Especially, is it imaginable, that after they had found how ill Paritie succeeded at *Corinth*, they would settle other Churches on that Lubrick Foundation, which must quickly be razed, and a new one laid. The Apostle wrote his Epistle to *Corinth*, wherein he reproveth their Schism, from *Ephesus*, in the year of Christ 51. as is commonly thought: and about that time (for he stayed at *Ephesus* two years) he was setling that Church in Paritie (for we find many Bishops or Presbyters in that one City; as *Jerome* observeth: calling them that were called from *Ephesus* to *Miletum* by the Apostle, *Presbyteros Ecclesiæ ejusdem*) now can any man think that he would have thus setled the Church of *Ephesus*, and not presently setled a Bishop in it, if at the same time he had found the want of a Bishop to be the cause of the Tumults at *Corinth*; and a Bishop to be the proper Remedy of them.

§ 9. The next Attempt that my Adversarie maketh on *Jerome*, is to prove that he held Episcopacy to be as old as the Apostles days, from his words, *Epistola ad Evagrium; Nam in Alexandria, à Marco Evangelista, usque ad Heracleam, & Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri unum ex se electum, &c.* Here he saith, *Salmasius* leaveth *Jerome*, and doubteth of the Truth of this History: which he need not think strange; seing himself also chargeth *Jerome* with a Mistake, *p.* 69. And I think none of us ever judged *Jerome* to have had an unerring Spirit to guide him in all that he wrote. But I shall not question the Truth of what he relateth; it may be the peculiar Name of Bishop to the Moderator, or *primus Presbyter*, began at *Alexandria*, as the Name of *Christian* did at *Antioch*. And no more but that can be gathered from *Jerome*'s words. Whatever may be said of the Evangelist *Mark*, who founded the Church of *Alexandria*, and it is like, by his extraordinary power, ruled it at first by himself; and that but for a small time; for he left *Alexandria*, and preached and planted Churches in *Lybia*, *Marmorica*, and many parts of *Egypt*, as *Beronius* sheweth. That *Jerome* did not include *Mark* (as *Dounam* absurdly saith) among the Bishops so chosen at *Alexandria*, is evident: for how could the Presbyters chuse him to be their Head, who had an extraordinary Commission, and had been the Instrument of converting them, and who by his extraordinary power, had setled them in a Presbyterie, for the rest, if our Author will draw any thing from *Jerome*'s words for his purpose, he must make him flatly contradict all that

that he had said, and laboriously proved, concerning the equality of Bishop and Presbyters: wherefore, they who came after *Mark*, and were chosen by the Presbyterie, were only set *in excelsiori gradu*, they had the προεδρία, were Moderators, and had the Name of Bishops given them usually, whereas the rest were called Presbyters; but that they had, so early as *Marci tempore*, Jurisdiction over their Brethren, the Presbyters who chused them, *Jerome* doth not say, nor can it be gathered from any of his words. And I do not question, but that in other Churches, as well as *Alexandria*, the Presbyters chose a Moderator, and, may be, he continued during Life; only *Jerome* thinketh that the Distinction was more taken notice of there than elsewhere; or sooner had the Note of a peculiar Name given to the *Præses*. If this Sense, that our Author dreameth of, were put on *Jerome*'s words, they must either contradict the whole of his Epistle, which is to prove that Bishop and Presbyter were one, till Ministers contended among themselves, and a Superiority came in *paulatim*, upon that; or it maketh *Jerome* to say, that Parity was observed in all other Churches till these Dissensions arose; but at *Alexandria* was Prelacy: which we cannot impute to *Jerome*, without making him absurdly contradict all Antiquity; which doth represent Uniformity in the Church in this Matter; and not such Discord. It is further evident, that *Jerome* did not mean, that there was a Prelate, with sole, or superior Jurisdiction, set up at *Alexandria*; in that he was chosen by the Presbyters from among themselves; and ordained also by them: he had no Prelation above them, but what they gave him: whereas a Bishop must be ordained by other Bishops: again, this is not spoken of by *Jerome* as a thing that the Presbyters must do, as being of Divine Institution; but what themselves chused.

§ 10. He hath another Exception against our Argument from *Jerome*'s Authority, *p.* 74. that he asserteth that *the Apostolical Traditions were taken from the Old Testament*. Where saith he, *two things are asserted. 1. That the Hierarchy of the Christian Church is founded upon Apostolical Tradition.* This is an absurd Inference. *Jerome* did indeed think that the Government of the Church at first, was founded on Apostolical Tradition, contained in the Scripture; but he is so far from making it to be a Hierarchy (in the Prelatical Sense) that he opposeth that, and pleadeth for Parity. The second thing he observeth is, that *the Apostles had the Model of the Temple in their view, when they erected the Plat-Form and Polity in the Church; the Bishop was the same with the High Priest in the Temple;*

Temple: and our Saviour made no Change but what was done did neceſſarly reſult from the Evangelical Œconomy which he was to eſtabliſh in the room of Levitical worſhip. Hence the Ancients ſo often reaſon from the Jewiſh Precedents to regulate the practice of the Chriſtian Church. Here are diverſe things to be examined, 1. How far Chriſt and his Apoſtles had reſpect to the Jewiſh Model, when they framed the Government of the Goſpel Church, I ſhall not now determine. I ſuppoſe they did as a man doth when he pulleth down an old Houſe, to build a new one: he doth not tye himſelf to the Dimenſions, the Form, nor number of Stories, or Rooms: yet what was in the old Houſe that was for his deſign in the new, he will readily obſerve. We are ſure the Goſpel Builders neither intended to reform, or patch, the old Jewiſh Church Fabrick. Such methods in Building, uſe to impare the Beauty, as well as uſefulneſs, of the Fabrick. It is certain that they did wholly demoliſh the Fabrick to the Foundation; (I mean, as to what was inſtituted, and not of the Law of Nature) as the Apoſtle ſheweth *Heb.* 7. 12. where he telleth us of the *change of the Prieſthood*, and alſo *of the Law*. And it is certain that the uſe of Prieſts, and of Levites to (whoſe Work was to ſerve the Prieſts in their Sacrifices) ceaſed, as ſoon as Chriſt offered up his Sacrifice once for all. Wherefore, as there was a new Prieſthood (to ſpeak in his Dialect) to be ſet up; which had another ſort of Work to do; to offer up ſpiritual Sacrifices: So our Lord and his Apoſtles accommodated their Inſtitution to what was needful, and convenient for that deſign; and had no further regard to what had been in the Jewiſh Church. Hence if he can ſhew that there is the ſame uſe of Biſhops under the New Teſtament, that there was of the *High* Prieſt under the Old Teſtament, he gaineth this Argument: but this, I hope, he will not attempt. The High Prieſt was a Type of Chriſt, as He is the Head of the Church, and as He offered up that one Sacrifice, which all the inferior Prieſts under the High Prieſt's Conduct and Authority, were eſpecially employed in. Muſt we therefore have a multitude of Biſhops in the Chriſtian Church, to repreſent a Saviour for every Dioceſs, under whom the Presbyters offer up ſpiritual Sacrifices? 2. That *the Biſhop is the ſame with the High Prieſt*, is not only ſaid without all Scripture Warrant; but is moſt abſurd: for the High Prieſt was one in the whole Church of God; but the Biſhops are many in the Goſpel Church of Chriſt. And indeed this way of Reaſoning will either eſtabliſh the Pope as Head of the Univerſal Church, or it is wholly inſignificant. 3. That our Saviour introduced no Change but what was neceſſary

ceſſary for the Evangelical Æconomie, is firſt ſaid without Book he uſed his Libertie, nor did he tye himſelf to the old Pattern. Next, the new Æconomie did require this change that there ſhould be no High Prieſt: becauſe one man could not ſo manage the Affairs of the whole Chriſtian Church, as he could do of the Jewiſh Church. 4. *Jerome* doth not here infer a Prelacy among Presbyters, from the Subordination of Prieſts in the Temple: his whole purpoſe is to ſhew that Deacons, the Servants of the Church, were inferior to Presbyters, the Rulers of it; and this he ſetteth forth by the Similitude (not binding Pattern) of the Levites being inferior to the Prieſts, whom they ſerved in the offering of Sacrifices: wherefore he doth not tell us that the Biſhops were what the High Prieſt was; and the Presbyters what *Aarons* Sons were, and the Deacons what the Levites were; but he ſets *Aaron* and his Sons on the one ſide, and compareth them with the Biſhops or Presbyters (whom he had been proving to be the ſame) and the Levites on the other ſide, to whom he compareth the Deacons. 5. If he can ſhew us that any of the Ancients do ſo reaſon from the Jewiſh, to a Chriſtian Hierarchie, as to infer that they ſhould be alike, or that they infer any more from it than diverſitie of Degrees of Church Officers, we ſhall conſider what they ſay.

§ 11. A further Effort he maketh againſt what we bring out of *Jerome*: he taketh notice *p.* 74, 75. That, Jerome *citeth the genuine Epiſtles of* Ignatius; *in which the Divine Original, and Inſtitution, of Epiſcopal Eminence and Juriſdiction above Presbyters, is frequently and plainly expreſſed.* And after, *when we find him citing the Epiſtles of Saint* Ignatius *as the genuine words of that holy Martyr, it muſt be acknowledged that he never dreamed of any Interval, after the Apoſtles, in which the Church was governed by Parity of Presbyters.* This is a ſtrange way of reaſoning: *Jerome* ſaith that *Ignatius* wrote ſuch and ſuch Epiſtles, *Ergo*, though he teacheth Doctrine flatly contradictory to what they contain, yet he taketh for certain Truth all that is ſaid in them: neither will this follow from *Jerome*'s believing that *Ignatius* was a good man, and a holy Martyr: good Men may have different Apprehenſions of things, and yet own the Writings of one another to be genuine. All that *Jerome* ſaith is, that *Ignatius* wrote an Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, another to the *Magneſians*, &c. He doth not cite one word out of them for Epiſcopacy, nor can any man aſſure us that theſe Epiſtles now Extant are the ſame that *Ignatius* wrote, and that *Jerome* mentioneth; or that they are not vitiated.

will not digreſs to debate about *Ignatius*'s Epiſtles, whether they be ſpurious or legitimate; whether they were by *Ignatius* the Martyr, or by an other of that Name, long after: but I much queſtion what our Author confidently aſſerteth, that *the Divine Original and Inſtitution of Epiſcopal Eminence or Juriſdiction above Presbyters, is, in them, frequently and plainly expreſſed.* When he ſhall think fit to produce the places where this is done, we ſhall conſider them. He bringeth another Evidence, as he thinketh, of what was *Jerome*'s Opinion in this Matter, *p.* 77. out of his Commentaries on *Mat.* 23. *Quod fecerunt & Apoſtoli per ſingulas Provincias Epiſcopos & Presbyteros ordinantes.* I do not find that Commentarie among *Jerome*'s Works, and therefore cannot judge by the Threed of his Diſcourſe, of what he deſigned by that Expreſſion: but the words contain no Argument; for bare mentioning of Biſhop and Presbyter doth not prove them to be diſtinct; eſpecially out of the mouth of one who had taken ſo much pains to prove them to be the ſame. *Jerome* might well ſay, in the Dialect of his Age that the Apoſtles ordained Church Rulers, whom we now diſtinguiſh by theſe Names. What he bringeth next is wholly againſt Senſe and Reaſon; that *this Conſtitution* (ſetting Biſhops over Presbyters) *followed immediatly upon the Confuſions and Schiſms that aroſe in the Apoſtolical Church*; becauſe *Jerome in Epiſtola ad Titum*, ſaith, *priuſquam vero unuſquiſque eos quos baptizaverat ſuos putavit eſſe, non Chriſti, in toto orbe decretum eſt, ut unus, &c.* The abſurdity of this Fancy I have above ſhewed: if he would prove what he deſigneth from this Teſtimony; he muſt aſſert that *Paul, Apollos*, and *Cephas*, 1 *Cor.* 2. thought that they whom they baptized were theirs, not Chriſts; and that they were the Authors of the Schiſm at *Corinth*. which I hope he will not ſay: It is evident that *Jerome* ſpeaketh of a Schiſm made by ambitious and ſelfiſh Church men: and after that Schiſm Biſhops were ſet up; which no man will ſay was in the Apoſtles time. *He* hath yet another proof of *Jerome* being for Prelacy: *p.* 78, 79. out of his *Catalogus ſcriptorum Eccleſiaſticorum*, where he giveth account of ſeveral Biſhops ordained and fixed in places, by the Apoſtles themſelves. The Anſwer is plain and eaſie: the Apoſtles did indeed fix Biſhops in Churches; that is Miniſters, who were to teach and rule them: but that theſe Biſhops (who are alſo called Presbyters) had Juriſdiction over other Presbyters, is the queſtion, and is not determined by this Argument.

§ 12. He next citeth *Jerome*, *Epiſtola ad Nepotium. Eſto ſubjectus pontifici tuo, & quaſi animæ parentem ſuſcipe: quod Aaron & filios ejus, hoc Epiſcopum*

pum & Presbyterat ejus neverimus. This Citation is lame: between the two Sentences which our Author conjoineth, there is, besides other things, this Passage; *sed Episcopi Sacerdotes se sciant esse, non Dominos: honorent Clericos quasi con-Clericos: Ut & ipsis à Clericis quasi Episcopis honor deferatur: scitum est illud oratoris Domitii, cur ego (inquit) te habeam ut Principem, cum tu me non habeas ut Senatorem.* Then followeth, *quid Aaron, &c.* And he addeth, *unus Deus, unum Templum, unum etiam Ministerium*: and he citeth to this purpose, 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3. and addeth, *pessimæ consuetudinis est quibusdam Ecclesiis tacere Presbyteros, & præsentibus Episcopis non loqui; quasi aut invideant, aut non dignentur audire.* It is evident that *Jerome* is here speaking of what was the way and practice in his time, and not of what was the Apostles practice, or what was Divine Institution: and therefore nothing here said can serve my Adversaries purpose: for our present Debate is, whether *Jerome* thought that Episcopacy was of Divine Institution. Next, it is also manifest, that *Jerome* is here reproving the height that some Church men were then aspiring to; not approving the way of that time. We deny not that in that Age, the paritie of Presbyters had begun to be encroached upon; in some places more, and in some less: though we see no cause to think, that Church Domination had then arrived at the height that our Antagonist pleadeth for. 3. It appeareth by a strict and unbyassed View of all that *Jerome* here saith, that no further Prelation is here hinted at than that of any Minister of the Gospel, or of the Moderator of a Presbyterie: for every Minister may be called *Pontifex*, and *Parens animæ* (as the Dialect then was) and may clame Subjection from the people in the Lord. What is said of *Aaron* and his Sons, importeth no more but that all Ministers have Authority, as all the Priests had: it is a Similitude, and it must not be stretched to an exact agreement in all things. 4. That *Jerome* maketh a Distinction between *Episcopos & Clericos*, can be drawn to no more but this; that in his time, there was an observable Prelation in matter of Dignity; it no way proveth a Superiority of Jurisdiction; though I deny not but that some were then aiming at it. His Citation out of *Ep.* 54, *Hieron.* I find not, he hath not told us to whom that Epistle was written. It seems these Epistles are not the same way ranked in my Edition and in his. That he saith there, *Episcopi apud nos tenent locum Apostolorum*; cannot prove his point: for the same may be said of all Presbyters; and *Jerome* saith so expresly of them, Ep. *ad Ocean.* as I cited § 31 they succeed to the Apostles in that part of

Church

Church power that is competent to them: and he cannot prove that Bishops succeed to them in all the power they had: but the Dispute about this will fall in afterward. That *Jerome* speaketh about an *Ecclesiastical Prince*, or *Governour*, is also inconcludent: for the Fathers sometimes speak as big words of Presbyters. He citeth also *Ep. ad Paulinum*, *Episcopi* (saith he) *& Presbyteri habeant in exemplum Apostolos & Apostolicos viros, quorum honorem possidentes habere putantur & meritum.* All that he can draw from this is, that there was such a Distinction in *Jerome*'s time; which is not denyed: but *Jerome* doth not here define what power the one of these had above the other. He had been telling *Paulinus*, how Men of other Professions laboured to imitate them who had excelled in their way; and instanceth the *Roman Captains*, *Philosophers*, *Poets*, *Orators*; and this he applieth to Church men; that they also should follow the best Examples: it were ridiculous to strain it to this sense, that Bishops should imitate the Apostles, and Presbyters the Apostolick men: especially seing our Author will say that many of these were Bishops. His *exors & ab omnibus eminens potestas*, he mentioneth by so indistinct a Citation, that I know not where to find it; and therefore shall say nothing of it. To his Recapitulation of all that he had said on *Jerome p.* 79, 80. I oppose the Answers I have given to the several things he there mentioneth; which duely considered, let the Reader judge what ground there is for his Triumph that he concludeth this Discourse with.

§ 13. Our Author proceedeth *p.* 80, *& seq:* to vindicate *Augustine, that he was no Presbyterian.* And, pray, who ever said he was one? That way was past its Meridian in the World a little before his time: only we bring his Authority to prove, that some great Lights of the Church did not look on Episcopacy as of Divine Right; or to have been in the Church from the Apostolick Age. He prefaceth this Dissertation with a Digression (as himself calleth it) containing insolent Contempt of, and Reproach against the Presbyterians; calling all that have written, beside *Blondel* and *Salmasius*, *the little Bouffoons of the Party*: he must here understand the *London* Ministers. the five eminent Men under the name of *Smectymnus*, *Rutherford*, *Didoclavius*, *Gersom Bucer*, and many others. If Presbyterians did incline to act the part of *Bouffoons*, this Book, and many others like it, might furnish them plentiful Matter. He chargeth them with *Impiety*, *p.* 82. calleth them *factious and unmortified Men*: their Opinions, *Dreams*: saith, *they have nothing more in their view than to gratifie their Revenge, and other Passions*: imputeth *Impudence and Irreligion*

to them, on account of this their Opinion. And his Confidence ſwelleth ſo high as to tell us, how *aſtoniſhing it is that ſo much is written for Parity. If we believe the Eccleſiaſtical Records, there remaineth no Debate that Epiſcopacy is Divine, Apoſtolical, received without Interruption, and that by the Univerſal Church. That Scepticiſm will (by natural Conſequence) pull down things more ſacred, than the outward Hedge of Government*: If his Arguments prove to bear any Proportion to his big Words, there can be no ſtanding before him. *He* had been wiſer if he had aſſerted leſs, and proved more: and if he had managed this Controverſie with a more ſedate Mind, it may be his ſucceſs had been no leſs. I will not contest with him in Railling, nor huffie and bold aſſerting what is in controverſie: but am willing to reaſon the Matter fairly and calmly. The Paſſage out of *Auguſtine* which *Blondel* and *Salmaſius* bring is, *Ep.* 19. which is *ad Hieronymum*: *quanquam ſecundum bonorum vocabula quæ jam Eccleſiæ uſus obtinuit, Epiſcopus Presbytero major ſit, tamen in multis rebus Auguſtinus Hieronymo minor eſt.* I freely yield to my Antagoniſt, that *the deſign of that Epiſtle is to invite* Jerome *to uſe all freedom in their Epiſtolary Converſation*: and I add that this was needful, conſidering the higher Character (in the common eſtimation of that Age) that *Auguſtine* ſuſtained, above *Jerome*, a Presbyter; and therefore I lay not the ſtreſs of our Argument on his owning *Jerome* to be in ſome things above him; nor do I think that *Auguſtine* lookt on himſelf and *Jerome* as ſtanding on a Level, in reſpect of Dignity, as then it was eſteemed: but I place the force of our Argument on theſe two; the one is, *Auguſtine* inſinuateth no Prelation that he had above *Jerome*, even according to the Sentiment of that Age, but what was *ſecundum bonorum vocabula*: he had a higher Title, he giveth no hint of a Superior Juriſdiction, that he, a Biſhop, had above *Jerome*, a Presbyter: which had been much more pertinent, and full as conſiſtent with the Modeſty and *Humility* that he expreſſeth. The other is, that even that ſuperior *Honour*, he doth not derive from Divine Inſtitution, or Apoſtolical Tradition, or conſtant Practice from the beginning; but from the Cuſtome of the Church that then (that is in that Age) prevailed.

§ 14. After ſetting down at length this Teſtimony from *Auguſtine*, he undertaketh to ſhew that *the latter Sectaries* (ſo he is pleaſed to digniſie the Presbyterians) *miſtake his meaning, and that* Auguſtine *never thought that Parity obtained in the Chriſtian Church. He* endeavoureth then to prove, that by *uſus Eccleſiæ*, Auguſtine *meant no other thing, than the univerſal*

versal Practice of the Christian Church from the beginning: and that this Notion is very familiar to him, that Catholick and universal Customes had their Rise from Apostolick authority. Before I consider what he saith on this Head, I shall suggest one Consideration that will make it wholly unserviceable to his Design: *viz.* that our Argument is not built simply upon the Phrase *usus Ecclesiæ*: but partly in his distinguishing Bishops from Presbyters in respect of Dignity, not Jurisdiction; partly on his mentioning *usus Ecclesiæ* not which *semper obtinuit, sed* which *jam obtinuit.* He speaketh not of universal Practice, nor of perpetual Practice; but for a Practice that in his time had become common. I shall now attend to what he pretendeth to bring for his Opinion about *Austines* meaning: he telleth us *p.* 85. that *this Father complained that many Usages had crept into the Church that were burdensome and uneasie, of which they knew the Original; but for such Customes and Constitutions as were received universally, in all Churches, from the very first preaching of the Gospel, these he always considered as Sacred, and inviolable, and of Apostolick Authority*: and of this sort, he saith, *Austine thought Episcopacy to be*: and he bringeth in *Augustine* reasoning thus: that *what was confirmed by universal Custome in the Christian Church, could have no beginning latter than the Apostles*: his words are, *quod universa tenet Ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum, non nisi authoritate Apostolorum traditum rectissime credimus.* He telleth us again *p.* 87. to make his Assertion surer, as much as repeating it can do; that *usus Ecclesiæ in* Austine's *Language, signifieth nothing else than the universal Practice of the Christian Church, which obtained in all Ages, and in all places, and therefore must needs spring from no lower Original than Apostolick authority.* And hence he pleadeth, that *unless we can shew what Council, Provincial or Œcumenick, introduced Episcopacy, it must be purely Divine.* To all this I oppose a few Considerations. First, that upstart Customes of whose Original we can give account and these that are immemorial, are not only to be distinguished, but differently regarded, I think it is very reasonable: and this learned Father did wisely observe it; but that so much weight is to be laid on this Distinction, that every thing is to be accounted Divine, the first Rise of which we cannot account for, I cannot assent to that; nor do I find that *Austine* was of that Opinion. There were Customes, even in the Apostolick Church, which he will not say were of Divine Institution, and yet he cannot tell when and by whom they began: such as the *Love-Feasts*; to which I may add the *osculum pacis*, which though the manner of it was enjoyned

joyned by the Apostle, that it should be done holily, without Hypocrisie or Lasciviousnes; yet I think few will say, the thing was enjoyned; for then all the Churches should sin in neglecting it. And if there were such Customes that then crept in, why might it not be so afterward?

§ 15. I observe 2. From his Discourse, that there is no ground to think that *Augustine* thought every Custome Apostolical, of which the Original, or time of beginning, could not be shewed: because that were to make Custome, and not Scripture the Rule of our Faith and Practice: and it would likewise infer the *Infallibility* of the Church, not only in her Decrees, but in her Customes: which is a stretch beyond the Papists themselves. If this Doctrine be true, no Custome of the Church can be contrary to, yea, nor without Warrand from Apostolick Tradition: it is not to be thought that *Austine* thought so, who every where pleadeth for having Recourse to the written Word of God, where there is any Controversie about our Faith or Practice. The words cited cannot be so far stretched; but are to be understood, in Subordination to the Scripture; where a Custome hath always, and universally obtained; and it is not inconsistent with the Scripture Rule; that may be indeed lookt on as of Divine Original, if it be in a Matter that Religion is nearly concerned in. If we should yield this Doctrine about the Influence of Customes, as a Rule of Faith and Practice; yet it must be understood to comprehend the Custome of the Apostolick Age, together with that of after times: for to say that after the decease of the Apostles no Custome could creep in which was not Divine, is a bold Assertion. If while the Apostles watched over the Church, some Weeds might grow much more after their decease, *while men slept*, it might be so. 4. If his Doctrine about Customes in general, were never so unexceptionable; how will he prove that Episcopacy is such a Custome, or that *Augustine* lookt on it as such? Herein lyeth our present Debate; and he fancieth *Austine* is on his side, because he extolleth Custome; if he can prove that *Austine* thought that *universa Ecclesia semper tenuit*, that a Bishop hath Jurisdiction over Presbyters, we shall part with this Argument, and lean no more to *Austines* Authority. This he hath not attempted, and we are sure he can never perform it. 5. We are not obliged to tell what Council introduced Episcopacy. But we can prove, first; that it might come in an other way, as the *Tares grew when Men slept*; he might with as good Reason, when we see Tares growing among Wheat, prove that these Tares are good Wheat, because we cannot

not tell when, or by what particular Hand, they were ſowen. Did not our Lord foretell that Corruptions would inſenſibly creep into the Church, by this Parable of the Tares? Sure Deciſions of Councils are not the only way of corrupting the Church. 2. If we prove that Epiſcopacy is contrary to Apoſtolick practice, and to Scripture rule, it muſt needs be evil; though it have come in by no Council: if we find a Thief in the Houſe, or a Diſeaſe in the Body, we may look on them as ſuch, though we cannot tell how the one got into the Houſe, nor give account of the procatartick Cauſe of the other: now as to what we conteſt about, if we do not prove that it is not the way that Scripture commendeth, or that the Apoſtles allowed, we muſt yield the Cauſe. Before I proceed to what he further offereth, I muſt take notice of a word that he ſeemeth to ſmother, and yet it looketh like an Argument, *p.* 86. about the middle he ſaith, Auſtine *intended no more, but that now under the Goſpel, by the conſtant and early practice of the Church, from the days of the Apoſtles, the Character and Dignity of a Biſhop, was above that of a Presbyter.* He putteth, *now*, in a different Character, and expoundeth it by, *the days of the Goſpel.* This Interpretation is a doing Violence to the Text; for if *now* be ſo underſtood, he muſt tell us when the time was, that the Diſtinction of theſe *honorum vocabula, Epiſcopatus & Presbyterium*, were not in uſe. Were they one and the ſame under the Law? Or is it imaginable that *Auſtine* would after 400 years, or there about, ſpeak ſo of that Diſtinction, if it were no newer? He citeth alſo 1 *Cor.* 11. 16. *We have no ſuch Cuſtome, nor the Churches of Chriſt*: doth he think this Scripture ſo clear and expreſs an Aſſertion of his Concluſion, that he ſaith not one word for bringing it to his purpoſe: the Apoſtle is there ſpeaking of things wherein Cuſtome is indeed the Rule, as having the Head bare, or covered, wearing long or ſhort Hair: it doth not thence follow (if the Apoſtle did there make it the Rule) that it muſt alſo be the Rule in other things, *p.* 88. he pretendeth to convince us further, that *Auſtine diſtinguiſhed the Cuſtome of the Univerſal Church, from the Cuſtome of particular places, and he maketh the one mutable, the other not ſo.* He needed not be at pains to convince us of that Diſtinction. I know no body that doubteth of it, nor that reject the Cuſtomes that are truly Univerſal, unleſs they claſh with Scripture. But he ſhould rather have tryed his Skill in convincing us, that Epiſcopacy hath been ſo uſed in the Church, or that *Auſtine* meant ſuch a Uſage, by his *uſus Eccleſiæ.*

§ 16.

§ 16. Another thing our Author undertaketh, for vindicating *Austine*, is, to prove that *he doth positively assert that the Succession of Bishops in the See of* Rome, *did begin at* Peter; *and thence argueth against the Donatists; that their Error was a Noveltie, because in all that Succession of Bishops there was no Donatist: if* (saith my Antagonist) *there was a Period in the Christian Church after the days of the Apostles; in which the Church was governed without Bishops, by a Paritie of Ecclesiastical Officers, the Donatists might evite that Argument, by denying such a Succession.* This is one of the silliest of all Arguments: it is *captio ab homonymia:* there was a Succession of faithful Men, who taught and ruled the Church of *Rome* for so long a time, among whom was no *Donatist*: it followeth indeed that the Opinion of *Donatists* was a *Noveltie*; but doth it follow that in all that Interval, that Church was governed by Prelates, with Jurisdiction over Presbyters? unless he can prove that every one named in that Succession ruled the Church by himself, without the joint Authority of the Presbyters, he saith nothing to the Purpose in hand. He cannot be ignorant, that the word *Bishop*, signified in the Scripture Dialect, and in the Age that followed, any Church Ruler: and therefore that these men are called *Bishops*, cannot prove their sole, nor superior Jurisdiction. *Austines* Argument from this Succession, is equally strong against the *Donatists*, whether these called *Bishops*, were such as do we now distinguish by that Name from other Presbyters, or were the Ministers of the Church of *Rome*; or were Moderators of the Presbyterie there. If he had taken his Argument from *Austines* naming but one Bishop in *Rome* at one time, it would have seemed to have more of sense. But even so, it would not be so concludent; for naming of one who might be the oldest, the most eminent, or the *primus Presbyter* or *Præses* in the Meeting, doth no ways infer that he had Jurisdiction over the rest. From this our Author inferreth, *p.* 90. that *usus Ecclesiæ*, in *Austines* sense, is the practice of the Church from the days of *Peter*. I think none else can see this Consequence; for in the one place he is distinguishing Bishops and Presbyters; in the other place (and they are different Books) he hath no occasion to take notice of that Distinction: nor is there any Affinity between the one Passage and the other. He further argueth, that *Austine* reckoneth *Aerius* an Heretick, on account of his Opinion about the Identitie of Bishop and Presbyter. This I have taken notice of above, § 1. It is no way to our present purpose, *Austine* disliked the Opinion of *Aerius*, as contrary to the Sentiments that then

then prevailed, *Ecclesiæ usu*: doth it thence follow that he thought Episcopacy was *Juris Divini*? Whether his unseemly Reflection on Mr. *Andrew Melvil*, be a better proof of our Authors Christian Temper, and Veracity, or of his Skill in close reasoning, I leave it to the Reader to judge. His repeating the Argument from Succession of Bishops, *p.* 91. doth not make it stronger. When he can say no more that looketh like Argument, he (according to his laudable Custome) concludeth this part of the Debate, with Railling and abusive Reflections; and confidently asserting his Conclusion, *ad nauseam usque. Few of the* Scots *Presbyterians read any of the Ancients*: *they consult* Blondel *and* Salmasius, *and go no further than* Smectymnus: he telleth us of *their incurable Peevishness*: *they think to understand the Fathers by broken Sentences, torn from their neighbour places, when they have neither the Patience, nor good nature, to consider what the same Author saith else where*: he calleth them, *hauling People*, and their way *Confusion, and æquality. It is not only new but absurd; supported by Dreams and Visionary Consequences*: *their Doctrines contradict the common Sense of Mankind, as well as the universal and uninterrupted Testimony of all Christian Antiquity.* Thus he bantereth his Adversaries, when he cannot beat them out of their Principles, by the force of Argument. in this way of Debating I am resolved he shall have the last word: which uses to be a pleasant Victory to Men, or Women, who fight with this Weapon.

SECTION VII.

The Authors Arguments examined, which pretend to prove the Succession of Bishops to the Apostles.

MY Adversarie hath hitherto acted defensively. In his second Chapter *p.* 94. *& seq.* he beginneth to assault us with his Arguments for Episcopacy. He placeth his main strength in this, that *the Bishops were Successors to the Apostles*; and that *when the Apostles went off the Stage, they left* Diocesan Bishops *to rule over the Presbyters and People, as themselves had done.* And now he pretendeth to fix the true state of the Controversy: which he should have done before he had so largely debated it: we might for him been fighting in the Dark all this time: and neither understood against whom, nor about what we contend. He sheweth his wonted Benignitie, and good Temper, in his Preamble to

his stating of the Question; when he saith, *such as design no more than Confusion and Clamour, endeavour to darken the true State of the Controversie.* That the Presbyterians have such Designs we disown, (and it may be presumed we know our own Designs better than he doth) neither have we take upon us to judge his design in this Book, but leave that to the unbyassed who read it, and consider his Strain and his Arguments. To his stating the Question he premiseth two things agreed on; that *Government is not ambulatory.* I am glad that we are agreed about this; it was not so when the Magistrate was on their side; we were always of that Opinion, but so were not they generally; otherways Dr. *Stillingfleets Irenicum* had not got such universal Acceptance among them as it did. He saith *we are likewise agreed that there was a Hierarchy in the Old Testament: whence this Conclusion is necessary, that the Subordination of one Priest to another is not* simpliciter *unlawful.* If I were a Papist, and disputing against *A. M.* D. D. for the Popes Supremacy, I would likewise pretend to this Concession from him, that under the Old Testament there was one Priest to whom the whole Church of God, Priests and People were subject; whence this Conclusion is necessary, that a single person be Head of the Universal Church, is not in its self *simpliciter* unlawful. This Author is in a great Mistake, if he imagine that we say that Episcopacy is *simpliciter*, and in it self unlawful: we think that Christ might have set up Bishops, yea a Pope (with such limited Power as his Wisdom might have seen to be consistent with the Churches good) in the Church, if so it had seemed good to Him. And if He had so done, we should cheerfully have submitted to the one, or the other; wherefore our Question is not, what was lawful antecedently to Christs Institution, but what He hath appointed, as the way how He will have His Church governed. The other thing that he premiseth to his stating of the Question, is an Enquiry into the *nature of the Apostolick Office*: where he laboureth to *separate the ordinary permanent, essential Power of the Apostles*, which he maketh to be *perpetual*; from the *extrinsick, and extraordinary Priviledges, and Advantages of that Power, suitable to the first Plantations of Christianity*; which he maintaineth to be *Transitory*, and to *have ceased when they died.*

§ 2. The Essence of the Apostolick Office he will have to be in the *Rectoral Power, or spiritual Jurisdiction that they had over other Ecclesiastick, and not in their extraordinary Gifts, nor Infallibility, nor in their immediate Call; nor in their being Witnesses of our blessed Saviours Resurrection*: and he proves

proveth of each of these, that *others beside the Apostles, had these Priviledges.* These things are asserted Dictatorie; but I see not from what Grounds he draweth these confident Decisions. It is not any where told us in the Word, what is precisely the Essence of the Apostolick Office, and what is accidental or extrinsick to it; and therefore we must be very Waste in determining so positively in this Matter. It might be expected that this Gentleman, who when the Presbyterians hold Paritie to be of Divine Right, requireth of them *plain Proofs, else they must be looks upon as Impostors, p. 13.* should give us very plain and positive Evidence for what he doth thus magisterially Dictate; and which he layeth for the Foundation of his Opinion concerning the Divine Right of Episcopacy: but here we are disappointed. He hath not attempted to prove that the nature of the Apostolate is not an Aggregate of all these, preaching Power, with Administration of the Sacraments, Supreme Jurisdiction in the Church, and that with Rule over all Churches, an immediate Call, extraordinary Gifts, Infallibility; to have seen the Lord. If one should assert that they who have all these are Apostles, and none else are Apostles; and so that these are the Properties of an Apostle, which agree to Apostles, *omni, soli, & semper*; and consequently they complexly taken, are the most essential Attribute of an Apostle, by which we must judge of the Essence of that Office (for we know not the Essences of things, but by their first, and essential Properties) how will our Author disprove this Opinion to establish his own?

§ 3. I shall set before the Reader the Opinions of others (on both sides) about the Matter of the *Apostolate*; or the distinguishing Characters of an Apostle; that he may be the better able to judge of this Authors Opinion about it; which yet is not his, but is borrowed from the Papists. But I first observe, that Christs twelve Disciples, who are by way of Eminency called Apostles, arrived at that height of Church Dignity and Power, by degrees: they were first called to be Believers: and afterward were sent forth as Preachers; Christ having bred them to that Work by their Converse with Him, for some time: in neither of these Degrees, had they any Church Power, except that of Preaching, and Baptizing: they were no Church Rulers; for there was as yet, no Gospel Church to be ruled, but they were still subject to the Government that was exercised in the Jewish Church: at last our Lord, after his Resurrection, gave them their Apostolick Commission; by which they were clothed with the Authority that belonged to that Office; and

sent them out, both with Authority to Teach, gather, and settle, and to govern Churches; and their complete Ordination, or solemn setting them apart for that Office, by which also, they were furnished for the Discharge of it, above what they had been before, was when the Spirit was poured out on them, on the day of *Pentecost*: they got their Commission *Mat.* 28. 18, 19, 20. but the pouring out of the Spirit on that day, was as it were putting the Broad Seal of Heaven to their Commission; as may be gathered from *Act.* 1. 4, 5. *Luk.* 24. 44. It is true, others, beside the Twelve, got some Drops of that heavenly Shower, but they had not the same Commission with them, and therefore the Measure that they got did neither authorize them, nor fit them for Apostolick Work. Another thing that I here observe is, that though the Name *Apostle* be given to others in Scripture, yet there were some to whom that Name was given in a peculiar manner; though the Word is sometime used at large, yet it is applyed to them, so as by it they are distinguished from other Church Officers: hence the Apostle not only taketh that Designation to himself, in the Inscriptions of his Epistles, but taketh pains to prove that he was an Apostle 2. *Cor* 9. 1, 2. Now our enquiry is, wherein consisteth the nature of that Office that they had, who by way of Eminence were called *Apostles*; or what are the Characters that they may be distinguished by from other Church Officers? If we can arrive at any Light in this, it will help us to understand whether the Bishops be Apostles, as some plead, or their Successors, as others imagine.

§ 4. I begin with the learned Bishop of *Worcester Iren. p.* 209. where he discourseth of the common use of the Word, but *p.* 210. he tells us, *that the Twelve were called Apostles, from their immediat Commission the they had from Christ, and that our Lord made use of the word* Sending *(as applied to them) in the proper and peculiar sense.* And he is so far from making Apostles and Bishops to be the same, that he maintaineth, that *no Argument can be drawn for the Form of Church Government from Christs Actions towards his Disciples. Whitaker*, against *Bellarm. de Pontif. Roman.* (who hath the same Notion of the Power given to *Peter*, that our Author hath of that given to the Apostles, and maketh the Pope to succeed to *Peter*, not in his extraordinary, but his ordinary Power; exactly as this Author saith of the Bishops, compared with the Apostles) *Whitak.* I say, bringeth his Proofs against the Popes being an Apostle, from these Characters of an Apostle: and this he borroweth from the Apostle himself, proving his own Apostleship: that *he was not called by men, Gal.* 1. 1.

Now

Now (saith he) *the Pope is called by many so* (i. e. Bishops) *as Christ is called the Doctrine, the Lamb, the Rock, &c. by Rhetorick*, Ibid. n. 2. Ep. 3. This agreeth neither to the Pope, nor Bishops: that he had seen Christ, 1 Cor. 9. 1. That *the Apostles were Witnesses of Christs Resurrection*, Act. 1. 22. You see then how our Writers maintain the Protestant Cause against Papists: that they give other Characters of an Apostle, which they make essential to him; and that this Enquirer hath not laid the Notions of this Matter that the Papists have. Calvin Instit. lib. 4. cap. 3. § 4. giveth these Characters of an Apostle: *his universal Charge, and not being tyed to a particular Church*: and for this citeth Mark 16. 15. and Rom. 15. 19, 20. where he observeth, that *there he saith he was to labour; but that unto which he was given alone to labour in: and that this Paul would prove his Apostolate, he doth not tell us of his gaining one City to Christ: but how he had travelled through a great part of the World, preaching the Gospel.* He mentioneth also another Character, that *the Apostles were tanquam primi Ecclesiæ architecti, qui eam fundarunt, ut alii ædificarent*: They were the first Planters of Churches, of which afterward. If it be objected, that these things belonged to the first, and extraordinary Apostles, not to these that are secondary, and permanent, or ordinary Apostles: This is to suppose what is in Question: the Scripture giveth us the Characters of the Apostles that were the first Founders of the Church; but giveth no account of other Apostles; therefore these other are not Apostles, except in the general Notion, as they are sent to do Church work: *Gersom Bucer. dissert. de gubern. Eccles. Episcop.* 70. *p.* 269. proveth, that the *Apostolate* was a distinct Office from all other Church Officers, from 1 Cor. 12. 29. *are all Apostles?* so that it cannot be confounded with the Episcopal Office, nor differ from it only in these accidental things that this Author speaketh of: and *Episcop.* 98. *p.* 383. he citeth both *Whitaker* and *Polanus*, making the Apostles such a distinct Office, to which there was no Succession in respect of their Degree, and making this a distinguishing Mark of that Office, that their Calling was ἀμέσος, *immediate*. The same hath *Paul Boyse, Dyocesi Wyol. p.* 92. *Didoclavi altari Damascen C.* 4. *p.* 141. citeth *Whitaker*, and *Junius*, to this purpose: and even *Tilenus*, who was no friend to Presbyterie, *Petrum* (saith he,) *unius loci aut urbis Episcopum facere, est Apostolicam dignitatem ei detrahere. de Pontif. lib.* 2. C. 4. *Not.* 6. and *lib.* 1. C. 27. *Not.* 7. he hath these words, *neque eum Apostolum ullius unius civitatis, tanquam gliebæ, ascriptum fuit, quod Gregorii est Episcopi, non Apostoli.* Also *lib.* 2. C. 12.

Not,

[illegible] Paris [illegible] Apostolos [illegible] Apostolos [illegible] Apostolos

inferior Officers. He further sheweth, that the Office of an Apostle differed from all the extraordinary Offices that were in the Church, in the beginning of the Gospel, particularly, the Evangelists (whose Office had the most Resemblance of the Apostolate) in that 1. They had not the same Mission with the Apostles (the one was immediatly from Christ, the other was from Him, by the Apostles: though their Gifts were sometimes immediate, and extraordinary.) 2. They were not under the infallible guidance of the Spirit, as the Apostles were; but were directed and ordered by the Apostles. 3. They had not their particular Instructions from Christ immediatly, as the Apostles, as appeareth from the *Epist. to Tim.* and *Titus* 4 They had not the Power of conferring the Gifts of the Holy Ghost by laying on of Hands, as the Apostles had. My design in all this is to shew, that we have little reason to take this our Authors Doctrine about the nature of the Apostolick Office, how ever confidently asserted by him, on his bare word; seing so many of all sorts of Protestants are against him in this: for his talk of the uniform Testimony of Antiquity for what he saith, we look on it as a groundless Fancie; that he can never make out. I find indeed that some of the Ancients call Bishops, and some of them call Presbyters, *Apostles*, in a large sense; that is Christs Ambassadors: but that some of them think, or say, that the Office of them who now rule the Churches, is the same with that of them who at first planted them, I find not: when he shall please to produce some of these Testimonies that he pretendeth to be uniform, they shall be considered.

§ 6 I cannot pass over without correction, an Argument he hath p. 99. to prove that it was not necessary to make up an Apostle, that he be immediately called to the Apostolate by our Saviour; *for* Matthias *was not immediatly ordained by our Saviour, but by the Apostles; who had power to continue that Succession to the end of the World.* A. It is most absurdly said, that *Matthias* was ordained by the Apostles; for if they had had power to ordain an Apostle, why made they use of *Lots?* They did not so in the Election or Ordination of any other Church Officer. I think *Lightfoots* Opinion will find moe to assent to it, his words are, *Apostoli non poterant Apostolum ordinare impositione manuum, prout Presbyteros ordinabant, sed sorte utuntur, quæ erat veluti immediata manuum Christi impositio in eum.* Nor doth it make against this, that it is said συνκατεψηφίσθη αὐτοῖς; for Dr. *Hammond* (who was as great an Asserter of Episcopacy as this Author can pretend to be, and understood as well what could be said

said for it) saith, *constat* Matthiam *sorte delectum fuisse, non per hominum suffragia.* And *Corn. à Lapide in locum, verbum hoc loco Catachrestice usurpatur de qualibet electione; idemque significat quod eligi, accenseri, annumerari.* Not only *Beza*, but *Corn. à Lapide*, expoundeth it, q. d. *hic sortis eventus communi omnium sententia comprobatus fuit.* And it is certain, that a Lot is a Divine Determination, *Prov.* 16. 33. *Cartwright, Mellif. Hebraic.* hath this Note on the Text, *quod sortem appellat judicium, docet, non nisi in rebus gravioribus ad sortem esse recurrendum; maxime cum per sortem Deus ipse in judicio sedeat.* It was not then the Apostles, but Christ himself, who chose *Matthias* to the Apostleship: nor was ever any Apostle chosen or called by Men; which the Apostle *Paul* denyeth of himself, as not agreeing to that Office, *Gal.* 1. 1. He telleth us, *p.* 100. *that the ordinary and perpetual Power that Christ gave to his Apostles, was derived by them to their Successors.* Here he supposeth that the Apostles had an ordinary and perpetual Power; which is that we now contend about; for we maintain that their Power was extraordinary, and ceased with them; and that it was an inferior sort of Power which their Succession got. He telleth next, that *the name also was derived to others beside the twelve.* That hath been already granted, that that Name, in a large sense, was given to others: yet in another sense it was restricted to the Twelve: But he is very unhapy in his Proof of this uncontested Truth; by Instancing *Phil.* 2. 25. where *Epaphroditus* is called the *Messenger, Ἀπόστολον*, of the Church of *Philippi*: for it is plain from the Text, that he is so called as being sent by the *Philippians* to *Paul*, and not as sent of God to them (tho we deny not but that in that sense he might be called an Apostle) for in that he is said, with the same Breath, to be he that Ministred to *Paul's* wants; and seeing it is as evident from the Text, that he was then with *Paul* and not at *Philippi*; it appeareth that he had been sent by them to *Paul* with some token of their bounty, for the Apostles subsistance. Thus *Grotius* expoundeth this Place: who saith, that *they who gathered and carried the sacred Money were called Ἀπόστολοι*: and likewise, he saith, that *the Philippians had sent Money to Paul by Epaphroditus, which he received, because being in Bonds, he could not then work with his hands* For the same interpretation are *Beza, Piscator, Zanchius, Vorstius*; yea, *Estius*, who citeth *Thomas Aquinas* for it; and *Cajetan.* But he undertaketh to prove his sense of the word, by this Assertion, that *an Apostle, in the New Testament, never signifieth a Messenger sent by men to men; but always a Messenger sent from God to men.*

This

This he extendeth to other places, as 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. This assertion is wholy groundless: yea, it is false, as I have already proved with respect to *Epaphroditus*, *Phil.* 2: 26. for 2 *Cor.* 8. 23. The word is not so to be taken there neither; for all his confidence in saying that *our Translation is certainly a mistake*. *Grotius* is here also against him; and saith, *they were called* Ἀπόστολοι, שְׁלִיחֵי, *because of their carrying Alms to the Churches of Judea*. And it is evident from the Context, which telleth us of *Pauls* sending *Titus* about this Affair *v.* 27. and *v.* 18, 19. Another Brother is chosen by the Churches to travel (*viz.* to *Judea*) with this Collection: and *v.* 22. Yet another Brother is sent with *Titus* and that Brother formerly mentioned. Now the Apostle giveth a Character of these Commissioners; as for *Titus*, as well known to the Apostle, being in high Station in the Church, and an *Evangelist*; he telleth that he was his *Partner*, and *Fellow Helper*; as for these other Brethren, he insinuateth that they must needs be very commendable persons; being chosen by the Churches, and so entrusted by them; in that they made them their Messengers. What he excepteth against this is frivolous; for they are not called *the glory of Christ* on account of this Employment; neither could they be called *the glory of Christ*, simply, on account of their being sent by him to the people; yea, or being Bishops: but they are so called, because of their *holy conversation*, and *faithful discharge of their Office*, what ever it was, in the Church. Another Scripture he bringeth *Rom*: 16: 7. where some are called ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, where saith he, *the Greek Phrase may be rendered, inter primarios Apostolos*. This is a Blunder that he would have thought sufficient to ruine the Credit of a Presbyterian for ever, as ignorant of the Greek, and of good sense: for neither can the word ἐπίσημος signifie *Primarius*, or *Chief*; but may well be rendered, *of note*, *noted*, or *eminent*: nor can ἐπίσημοι and Ἀπόστολοι, agree, as Substantive and Adjective, as this learned Author maketh them to do; contrary to all Rules of Grammar. The meaning is plain, that these men were *noted*, or *eminent* in the Church, and so esteemed among the Apostles, or by them; nor doth it at all import that they themselves were Apostles. So not only *Beza* and *Piscator*; but *Toletus*, *Vatablus*, *Grotius*. The falshood of his Assertion, p. 100. That *the word* Apostle *never signifieth a Messenger sent by men to men, but always one sent by God to men*; is evident from *Joh.* 13.16. *Neither is he that is sent*, Ἀπόστολος, *greater than him that sent him*; where the word is taken at large, for any one that is sent by another. And

the Verb whence it is derived, is often used for a Mans sending; as *Mat.* 2. 16. and 21. 3: and 27: 19: 2 *Tim.* 4: 12 *& passim.*

§ 7. He took notice, it seems, that his Adversaries make *Universality of Apostolick Jurisdiction* to be one distinguishing Mark of their Office, which Bishops cannot pretend to; and therefore Bishops have not the Substance of the Apostolick Office. Hence he laboureth to take this Scruple out of the way, *p.* 101, 102, 103, 104. And 1. He telleth us *the narrowness of the Limits of these Provinces assigned to the secondary Apostles* (he meaneth the Bishops) *did not alter the nature of their Office, from that of the twelve Apostles; more than the Kings of* Juda *lost the Honour of sitting on the Throne of* David, *after the Revolt of the ten Tribes.* Here is a gross Mistake of the Question, which is not, whether the largeness or narrowness of the Charge that a Church Ruler hath, do alter the nature of his Office; but whether a limited and particular Charge do not so differ from that which is universal and extended to the whole Church of Christ, as that he who hath the one Charge and he that hath the other is not in the same Office. Will any Papist say, that the Universal Bishop who sitteth at *Rome*, hath the same Office in the Church, and no higher than any poor Bishop in *Italy* or elsewhere? The Similitude brought from the Kings of *Juda* is impertinent to this purpose: if one had the Empire of the whole World, and lost that, and got the Crown of one particular Kingdom; I think his Office is not what it was. Beside, if we should yield all that he here alledges, it were no loss to our cause: for we do not make *universal Jurisdiction* the only Character of an Apostle; but that complexly, and in conjunction with others: as is above shewed. Another Consideration that he hath, is, *the Apostles themselves had not equal Bounds and Provinces for their Inspection, but some travelled further than others; yet this did not change their rectoral Power, or Jurisdiction: no more did the confining Bishops in the exercise of their Power, to narrower Limites, make their Power to differ from what the Apostles had: the Restriction not being by the nature of the Power it self; but from the various Necessities and Circumstances of the Church, the Rules of Order, and the multitude of Converts, which obliged them afterwards to more personal Residence.* I reply to this, 1. Here is a wide Door left for *the Holiness of Rome* to enter into the Church by: and it is observable, how naturally, and frequently, this learned Author, and some others of his Gang, do shew their Byass to that side. If nothing but Order, and Circumstances, and not Divine Institution, do confine Bishops to their Sees, whether larger

or

or less extended; and every one of them have, *actu primo* (as may be deduced from this Doctrine) universal Jurisdiction; why may not the exercise of it be committed to one of them; and the rest be subject to him? Some think that this belongeth to good Order, (though ordinary Pastors be related *actu primo*, to the Universal Church; yet they have not that Jurisdiction that the Apostles had, who needed no more but their intrinsick Power to warrant its Exercise in any particular place.) 2. It is without all warrant to suppose that every Bishop hath universal Power over the Church of Christ, as every Apostle had: they have not that Commission, *go teach all Nations*: this was the peculiar work of Apostles, to travel and plant Churches: the work of Bishops (if such an Office be in the Church) is to stay at home, and feed that part of Christs Flock which is committed to them. 3. It is fully supposed that the Apostles had so their several Provinces as that they were confined to these: the World was the Province of each of them; though by mutual Consent, or by the immediat Conduct of the Holy Ghost, who guided their Motions, (as may be gathered from *Acts* 17. 7, 9, 10.) they went into several places of the World; yet so as they observed not that Division very critically; for we find them meeting sometimes; and though *Peter* was the Apostle of the Circumcision, yet *Paul* often preached to the Jews. 4. The confinement of the ordinary Pastors to their several Charges is not the effect of Prudence, and Agreement of them among themselves, alone; but it is Gods Appointment, (though the setting of the Bounds of their several Districts in particular, be a work of men) for Christ hath not only set Pastors in the Church, but he hath set them over their particular Flocks, *Acts* 20. 18. so as they have the charge of them, and must give account of them; and not of the Souls in all Churches.

§ 8. His Notion, *p.* 103. that *the Apostles divided the World among themselves by Lot*, I know is to be found in *Eusebius*, *Dorotheus*, and *Nicephorus*, and some others of the Ancients; and some latter Writers have taken it on trust from them, as this Author doth: neither shall I be at pains to disprove it; it is done learnedly and fully by *Dr. Stillingfleet*, *Iren.* *p.* 232. *& seq.* by eight Arguments, that this Author will not easily answer: and particularly he sheweth, that *Acts* 1. 25. Κλῆρον Ἀποστολῆς, cannot be understood of a District appointed at first for *Judas*, and he falling from it was alloted to *Matthias*: which our Author taketh for an unconcerned Truth, *p.* 103. Another thing I observe is, *p.* 104. that he

faith, *neither the Apostles, nor their immediat Successors, were so confined to particular Sees, but that proportionably to the Exigencies of the Catholick Church their Episcopal care and Superintendency did reach the whole, as far as was possible; and as Christian Charity did require or allow, notwithstanding of their more fixed and nearer Relation they might have to particular Churches:* which he proveth by *their Epistles to other Churches*, and by *their Travels*: and he concludeth, that *the confinement to a particular See, doth not proceed from the nature of the Priesthood, but from the Rules of Prudence, Ecclesiastical Oeconomy, and canonical Constitutions.* I first take notice, that this is still beside the Purpose, for it can never evince that the Bishops are Apostles, unless he make it out that no other Mark can be assigned in respect of which they differ. We say, that though Bishops and Apostles were Universal Officers in the Church, there are other things wherein they differ, as hath been shewed. 2 That the Apostles had a fixed and nearer Relation to one particular Church more than another, is denyed, and he can never prove it. The contrary is proved abundantly by the Author last cited. It is true, some of the Fathers do sometimes call *James* Bishop of *Jerusalem*: but that is with respect to his Residence, not to the confinement of his Authority: he was determined to stay there, as the place which Christians did resort to from all parts of the World (not in Pilgrimage, but on many other Occasions) that he might there superintend the Affairs of the Universal Church. *Euseb. lib.* 2. *c.* 23. and *Jerome de viris illustribus*, say, he was by the Apostles ordained the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*; but this they take out of *Egesippus* (as themselves confess) a most Fabulous Writer, and both of them relate out of him, several things concerning the same *James*, that all do look on as idle Dreams. 3. It is also without warrant, that he asserteth, that the first Bishops were not confined to their Sees, more than the Apostles were. If he understand of the Evangelists, we shall debate the case afterward. If of ordinary Pastors of the Church, I deny not but that they had a regard to neighbouring Churches, which were not furnished with Pastors, or otherways had need of their help (so do Ministers at this day, and ought to do) and this is all that can be inferred from their *Epistles*, or their *Travels*, which he mentioneth: but that they had universal Jurisdiction, as every one of the Apostles had, we deny, and he hath brought no Proof of it. 4. Who ever thought that the Confinement of a Pastor to a particular Charge, doth proceed from the *nature of the Priesthood*? if one Pastor could feed Christs Flock,

Flock, more were superfluous: neither doth it proceed from mens Prudence, and Church Canons; but from Christs Institution, built on natural necessity. He directed his Apostles to ordain Elders in every City, and in every Church.

§ 9. He cometh now p. 105. to discourse of *Succession to these Apostles*, whose Office he had taken so much pains (to what purpose let the Reader Judge) to describe: and fixeth the Debate in this Question, *Whether the Apostles committed their Episcopal Jurisdiction and Apostolick Authority, which they exercised in particular Churches, to single Successors, duely and regularly chosen, or to a Colledge of Presbyters, acting in the Administration of Ecclesiastical Affairs, in perfect Parity and Equality?* And this he taketh to be the genuine State of the Controversie, and so do I; if some of his Prejudices, and unwarrantable Suppositions be cut off from it. For correcting this State of the Question, let it be observed first; that we will never own that the Apostles had any Successors in the whole of what was essential to the Apostolick Office: particularly, that rectoral Power that every one of them had over all other Ecclesiasticks: we deny that this was transmitted to Church Rulers who came after them. This our Author supposeth; whereas he should have proved it. That all that Power that was necessary for the Church, was transmitted from the Apostles to their Successors, we acknowledge: such as Power of Preaching, Administring of Sacraments, Ordaining Ministers, Ruling the Church: this they left in the Church; whether they left this Power to one in every Church to Rule the rest in these Administrations, or to many equally, is the Question. I join all these Powers together; because our Brethren with whom we now debate, our *Jure Divino* Prelatists, put them all in the Bishops hands alone, to be parcelled out to his Curats as he pleaseth. So that Presbyters may not preach, baptize, nor do any thing else in the Churches, without his allowance; they make the Bishop the sole Pastor of the Dioceſs. Wherefore our Author to this Question should have premised another, *viz.* whether the Apostles have any Successors at all, in the plenitude of that Power that they had over the Churches? He taketh it for granted, we deny it: and prove what we say. 1. The Apostles had their Power both as to its being, and extent, and that toward persons and things or actions, by an immediat Call: The Lord by himself, without any act of the Church interveening, pitched on the persons, made them Church Officers, and told them their work, and set the bounds of their Power. Now if any pretend

pretend to succeed to them in the plenitude of this Power, they must instruct the same immediat Call, or shew that the Lord hath left Directions in his Word, for clothing some persons with all that Authority: but this neither the Bishops, nor none else can pretend to. Not to an immediat Call; for then they must shew their Credentials. Nor to Scripture Warrant for all the Power of the Apostles; where is their Warrant for going through the World, in their own personal and intrinsick Authority, to order Affairs in all Churches where they come, or for instituting Gospel Ordinances; and appointing new Officers in the Church, that were not in it before: or even for ruling over their Brethren? This last I know they claim: and we shall debate it with them; but these others also belonged to the plenitude of an Apostolick Power. We have indeed sufficient warrant in the Word, for Men to Teach and Rule the Church; and these things are necessary to be, and a Power for doing that was needful to continue in the Church to the end of the World; but for other Powers that the Apostles had, they were only needful for planting the Gospel; not for Churches planted: neither have we Directions about propogating such a Power in the Church.

§ 10. Another Argument. The Apostles in their own time, divided their Power and Work among several sorts of Church Officers: they appointed Elders, some for Teaching and Ruling, as hath been proved; some for Ruling only, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. They appointed also Deacons, to have a care of the Poor; which was also a part of their Power: but they appointed none to succeed in the whole of their Power. This Conduct they could not have used, if they had been to have such Successors. If they made diverse sorts of Church Officers to succeed them, every one in his share of that work that is alloted to him. All which was done by the Apostles: and if they have not told the Church, that every one of these Officers must act in dependency on one, who is over them, as the Apostles were over all: how can we imagine that there is one Officer in the Church (by divine or Apostolick appointment) who hath all the Power that they had, and to whom all must be subject as to them. 3. The Fathers do not only make Bishops to be Successors to the Apostles, but they say the same of all Church Officers, *Ergo*, they did not think that any person succeded to them in the plenitude of their Power. The consequence is evident, for parcelling out their Succession, and one enjoying it *in solidum*, are inconsistent; the *Ant.* I prove by several Testimonies. *Ignatius Ep. ad Trall. Presbyteros vocat conjunctionem*

conjunctionem Apostolorum Christi: & *jubet, ut eos sequamur tanquam Christi Apostolos. Ep. ad Smyrnæ*: and *Ep. ad Magnes.* he saith expresly p. 23. *edit. Vossi*, that the Presbyters succeeded εἰς τόπον συνεδρίου Ἀποστόλων, *in the place of the Counsil of the Apostles. Irenæus adversus Hæreses lib.* 3: *c.* 2. saith, *traditionem quæ est ab Apostolis per successionem Presbyterorum custodiri*: and *lib.* 4: *c.* 43. enjoineth, *ut Presbyteris qui in Ecclesia sunt, & ab Apostolis successionem habent, auscultemus.* And *c.* 45. *Ubi* (saith he) *charismata Domini posita sunt, ibi discere oportet veritatem, apud quos est ea quæ est ab Apostolis Ecclesiæ successio. Cyprian lib.* 4. *Ep.* 4: affirmeth, *omnes præpositi* (and it is known that he giveth that Title also to Presbyters) *vicaria ordinatione Apostolis succedere. Jerome* (who was no Bishop) owneth himself for one of the Successors of the Apostles, *dist.* 35: *cap. Ecclesiæ in Apostolorum loco sumus, non solum sermonem eorum imitemur, sed & seorsum abstinentiam.* And *ad Heliodorum*: *absit ut de his quicquam sinistrum loquar, qui Apostolico gradui succedentes, Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt*: *& per quos nos Christiani simus.* August. *ad fratres in eremo*, calleth them expresly, among many glorious Epithets, *Apostolorum successores.* And Serm. 33. He hath these words, *non Laicis spiritualia dona tradita sunt*; *sed vicariis Domini, vicarii domini sunt qui vicem Apostolorum tenent*: which ye see he saith of all the Clergy.

§ 11. Another thing I dislike in this state of the Question is, that he supposeth the Apostles exercised their Jurisdiction in particular Churches. I have above shewed, that this they did not ordinarily, in Churches already planted, and furnished with Officers. A third thing is, that he supposeth us to maintain a *perfect Parity* among Presbyters in the administration of Ecclesiastick Affairs. This I also cleared, S. 2. § 5. that we own a temporary Disparity, though not a Jurisdiction, in our ambulatory Moderator. These things being cleared, the Question is to be understood of that ruling Power that was in the persons of the Apostles, and is now necessary to continue in the Church. The Question is, whether, when the Apostles setled Churches, and committed the Government of them to Officers who were to continue in Succession in all the Ages of the Church, they committed that ruling Power to a single person, or to a Colledge of Presbyters? He saith it was committed to a single Bishop, I maintain it was committed to a Colledge of Presbyters, without any Disparity of Power, or Jurisdiction among them. And I further add, that neither did the Apostles give more of this Power to one of the Presbyters above the rest, neither did they allow them to

transfer

transfer that equal Power into the Hands of another, and ſuffer him to rule over them. Some light Velitations he hath (before he came to his main arguments) for proving his Point. And 1. From *Chriſts promiſe, that the Apoſtolick office ſhall indure perpetually; and this promiſe was made to them, not in their Perſonal, but in their Spiritual capacity* I ſuppoſe he aimeth at *Mat.* 28: 20. where there is not one word of the Apoſtolick office in the Plenitude of that power they had. It reſpecteth their power of Teaching, Baptizing and Ruling; and the promiſe implieth that there ſhall be ſome to the end of the World who ſhall be imployed in that work; and it enſureth Gods preſence to them who are ſo employed; but it ſaith nothing, directly nor indirectly, how much of the Apoſtolick Power theſe Succeſſors ſhall have. His ſecond Hint of an Argument is, that *Chriſt loved the Church as much after the deceaſe of the Apoſtles as before.* A. It thence followeth that he did not let them want whatever ſpiritual Authority and Juriſdiction was needful for them: but it no way followeth, that the Apoſtolick Power, in all its Latitude, muſt continue; becauſe though that was needful for planting the Church, it is not needful for her watering, and her continuance. That *the Teſtimonies he is to bring were univerſally received, and the Church knew no other Government for* 1400 *years*; as he ſaith, *p.* 106. is one of his bold affirmations, which muſt ſtand for Argument, to his eaſie Believers.

§ 12. He undertaketh to prove that *the Apoſtles tranſmitted their Rectoral Power immediatly to ſingle Succeſſors*, both by Scripture, and by the Eccleſiaſtical Records. The firſt Scripture Proof is, from *Timothy being Biſhop at* Epheſus, *and* Titus *at* Crete. This his Argument he proſecuteth ſomewhat confuſedly: but we muſt follow whether he leadeth. He bringeth nothing for proof of their being Biſhops there, but that *the Apoſtle beſought* Timothy *to abide at* Epheſus, *when himſelf was going into* Macedonia, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *with acts* 20: 3, 4, 5. And then, after taking off (as he fancieth) one of our Exceptions againſt his Argument, he proveth, that *the work that they did was competent to a Biſhop.* The Exception that our Writers commonly bring, is from *Timothies* non reſidency at *Epheſus*, and travelling with *Paul.* His refutation of this, *p.* 107, is, that *Timothy after he was eſtabliſhed Biſhop at* Epheſus, *did often wait on the Apoſtle* Paul, *his ſpiritual Father, to aſſiſt him in the Offices of* Religion *but ſuch occaſional Journeyings cannot infer his being diſengaged from his Epiſcopal Authority at* Epheſus: Philip *was as much a Deacon when he went and preached at* Samaria, *as when he ſerved Tables at* Jeruſalem. *The Presbyterians*

rians have not loſt their Title to their particular Flocks, when they are imployed to viſit the Court, or Forreign Churches. The Ancients laid no weight on this Objection, for Concil: Chalcedon: Act 11 1: reckoned 27 Biſhops from Timothy *to their own days.*
The Reply to all this is eaſie. 1. He doth not propoſe our Argument fairly, nor in its full Strength: for then; this his Anſwer would appear triffling. We plead, that it cannot be made appear that ever *Timothy* was fixed at *Epheſus*, as Paſtor of that Church; but that he was only ſent to it, as *Pauls* Deputy, for a ſmall time, to do ſome Work there. *I beſought thee to abide ſtill at Epheſus*, 1 *Tim*: 1: 3. cannot import a fixed Charge: but on the contrary; that his being firſt ſent to that Place was lookt on as a Temporary Imployment; and the Apoſtle finding need of his being longer there than he at firſt thought, doth now lengthen out his Commiſſion for ſome longer time. If he had been fixed at *Epheſus* as his particular Charge, and in a Paſtoral Relation to that People, that was to end only with his Life, ſuch a Deſire for his ſtaying longer in that Place had been very impertinent. Again, the Strength of our Argument lieth in this; that we find *Timothy* not only now and then in other Places, Labouring in the Work of the Goſpel (that I confeſs is conſiſtent with a fixed Charge) but the Courſe of his Miniſterial Labours was, to be imployed elſe where, and we have little, or no more of him at *Epheſus* than what is mentioned in this place. We find that as ſoon as *Paul* returned to *Epheſus* from *Macedonia*, that he ſent *Timothy* thence to *Achaia*, himſelf ſtaying at *Epheſus*, *Acts* 19: 22: After *Paul* came from *Epheſus* to *Macedonia* again, and returned thence unto *Aſia*, we find *Timothy* with him; not at *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20: 1, 4: After which we never read that *Timothy* wrote, came, or returned to *Epheſus*. We find that *Paul* ſent him to *Corinth*, 1 *Cor*: 4: 17: and 16: 10: 2 *Cor*: 1: 19. And to *Philippie*, *Philip*: 2: 19. And to *Theſſalonica*, 1 *Theſſ*: 3: 2, 6. Alſo he joyneth with *Paul* in Writing his ſecond Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*, which was written at *Philippie*, and was ſent, as alſo the firſt, from the ſame Place: and in that to *Philippie* written from *Rome*; and in the firſt to *Theſſalonica* from *Athens*: and in the ſecond. He is alſo mentioned in theſe Epiſtles, as being elſewhere: but we read no more of his being at *Epheſus*. He joyneth with *Paul* in his Epiſtle to the *Coloſſians*, from *Rome*. He was at *Corinth* when *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Romans*, *Rom*: 16: 21: with the Poſtſcript of the Epiſtle. He was in *Italy* when the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews* was written, *Heb*: 13: 23: But in the Epiſtle to the *Epheſians*, which was written from *Rome*, long after the

time that *Timothy* was supposed to be made Bishop, no word of him neither as being at *Rome*, saluting them; nor as being at *Ephesus*, saluted by *Paul*. And it is strange, if when *Paul* speaks so much to the Elders of *Ephesus* at *Miletum*, *Acts* 20: 17, —— that he taketh no special notice of him their Bishop. Beside, he telleth *Timothy* that he had sent *Tychicus* to *Ephesus*, 2 *Tim*: 2: 12. and that about the same Work that he had enjoyned *Timothy* to do there; and mentioneth him as sent to them, *Ephes*: 6: 21, 22. So that there is full as much ground to say that *Tychicus* was Bishop of *Ephesus*, as to assign that See to *Timothy*: and more ground to make *Timothy* Bishop of several other Churches above-mentioned, than of *Ephesus*.

§ 13. I hope, 2. These Reasons against *Timothies* being Bishop at *Ephesus*, are not taken off by telling us of *Philip* the Deacon Preaching at *Samaria*: for it is probable, that *Philip* was now Called to an higher Office; and so might leave his Deaconship to another: or, he might return to his Work at *Jerusalem*, seing we read not of such a constant Course of his being elsewhere, as we find in *Timothy*. Neither is it paralell to a *Presbyterian Ministers visiting the Court, or Forreign Churches*. If they be constantly Abroad, and especially, if they were never more setled in a particular Place, save that such a Man was sent to Preach, and do other Ministerial Work there for a time, we think it a good Argument against their Pastoral Relation to that Place. If the *Council of Chalcedon*, *Act* 11. mention twenty seven Bishops in *Ephesus* (which I find not in *Caranza*, nor is it said by the Council, *Bibthoth. concil.* but by one Man, *Obiter. Leontius* Bishop of *Magnesia*, *Tom.* 4. *p.* 700.) it signifieth no more than that *Timothy* setled that Church (which he might do in the short time he stayed there) and from that time there had been so many Bishops, that is, Ministers, or Chief Ministers who were Presidents in their Presbyteries, during that time. This can neither prove *Timothy's* fixed Pastoral Relation to that People; nor the sole, or superior Jurisdiction of them who came after him. He next laboureth to prove that *Timothy* was Bishop of *Ephesus*, from *the Power he was to Exercise, and the Work he was to do there*; which he asserteth to be, *all the Power and Work they Claim for a Bishop*. And he insisteth at length, from the Epistles written to *Timothy*, to shew what was his Power and Work. We do not contest with him about this; as himself confesseth, *p.* 104, surely *Timothy* could do as much as any Bishop can lay Claim to: only we deny his being fixed there; and we deny that he Acted as an ordinary

nary fixed Officer; but as the Apoſtles Deputy, ſet there for a time, to do what the Apoſtle might have done, if he had been perſonally there. He was an *Evangeliſt*, and as ſuch Acted in *Epheſus*, and wherever elſe he was imployed. That theſe Epiſtles were Directed to *Timothy*; only with Reſpect to his Work at *Epheſus*, is by ſome imagined, without all ground. He was imployed here and there by the Apoſtle, and wherever he had Work, he was to manage it according to theſe Directions. It is an inconſequential Argument that our Author bringeth, *p.* 108. to prove *Timothy's* particular Relation to the Church of *Epheſus*, that 1 *Tim.* 3: 14, 15: *It is told him, that the Apoſtle gave him theſe Directions, that if he ſhould tarry longer from coming to him, he might know how to behave himſelf in the Houſe of God.* For all this may agree to any Church, as well as to that of *Epheſus*: and it cannot be ſaid (which followeth) of *Epheſus* alone, that that Church was *the Pillar and Ground of the Truth*: Wherefore, the Apoſtle intended theſe Injunctions not for *Timothy* alone; but for all Paſtors of the Church: far leſs for *Timothy* only while at *Epheſus*; but for him in whatever part of the Lords Vineyard he ſhould have Occaſion to Labour. Neither do we now Debate, whether *Timothy* had a particular Relation to the Church of *Epheſus* (which may be granted while he abode there) but whether he had a fixed Relation to it, ſo as he had not afterward to other Churches whereto the Apoſtle ſent him: or whether he was Related to it as an Itinerant *Evangeliſt*, or as as an ordinary and fixed Biſhop.

§ 14. He argueth alſo *p.* 109. that *his Power was not temporary or tranſient, but ſucceſſive and perpetual, and derived to others in ſolidum, as he received it himſelf*: and this he proveth, becauſe *he is injoyned to commit it to faithful Men who ſhould be able to Teach others alſo.* Here is ſtill a Miſtake of the Queſtion; which is not about the Perpetuity of *Timothy's* Power; which I believe he had wherever the Apoſtle ſent him about the Work of the Goſpel: but the Queſtion is about the Perpetuity of his Abode at, and Paſtoral Relation to *Epheſus*: which is not proved by his Power of Ordaining Miniſters. He demandeth *p.* 109, 110. ſomethings to be granted to him: ſome of which I freely yield. 1. That *this Power of Timothies was lawful.* 2. That *he exerciſed it at Epheſus*; viz. for a time. 3. That *it was committed to him alone, and not to a Colledge of Presbyters.* This I yield ſo far, that *Timothy* had a Vicarious Apoſtolick Power, that was ſuperior to that of the Presbytery: but it is no Conſequence, *Timothy* had ſuch a Power at *Epheſus* for a time, *Ergo*, the Presbytery was

not ordinary Rulers of that Church. I proved §. 7. That the Apostle setled a Colledge of Presbyters for the ordinary Government of that Church, and that from *Acts* 20. 28. 4. That *there is no mention of a Colledge to which Timothy was accountable for his Administrations.* The first part of this I deny: the grounds are mentioned in the place cited. Beside, it is like there was no such Colledge at *Ephesus* then; for *Timothy* is Directed about Chusing and Ordaining them: 1 *Tim* 3. 1 *&c.* The second part I freely yield, that *Timothy* could not be accountable to any Colledge of Presbyters, nor to any Man, except the Apostle who sent him: but this maketh nothing for such Exemptions to a Bishop; unless he could prove, each of them that they have a Personal Mission from an Apostle, or immediatly from Christ. 5. That *the great Branches of Episcopal Power was lodged in Timothy's Person*: this I yield, understanding it of that Power that Bishops pretend to. 6. That *this Authority was not in it self temporary, transient, or extraordinary; but such as the necessities of the Church do make necessary in all Ages.* This also, *sumo sensu*, I yield: it must always be lodged somewhere: but that there must be a single Person endowed with such Power, I know no lasting necessity for that. I Answer to his Question *p.* 110. *Why do they say, that in the discharging of an ordinary Trust, there is need of an extraordinary Officer.* *A.* We say an extraordinary Officer was needful at first, till ordinary Men were by him Authorized, and Impowered to propagate this Trust; but that being done, we plead for no such need; but Debate against it. Against *Timothy's* Episcopal Relation to *Ephesus* further Arguments may be brought; from the Apostles putting the Government of that Church in the hands of Elders, *Acts* 20. 28. 28. which must be after they were setled by *Timothy*, and that in his presence, he being then with the Apostle. Also, from the Apostles declaring to these Elders all the Council of God, *Acts* 20. 27. and yet he told them nothing of so important a point, as of the chief Pastor whom they must obey: a point that our Brethren lay so much stress on, as that they make the Being of Ministers and Churches to hang on the Succession of Bishops. From the Apostles not mentioning *Timothy* when he writeth to *Ephesus*. From his telling them that they should see his Face no more, *Acts* 20. 25. and yet not a word of leaving *Timothy* to take care of them, but laying it on the Elders, but I shall not enlarge on these.

§ 15. He alledgeth, with the same Confidence, and as litle Strength of Argument, that *the same power was committed by Paul to Titus, in Crete.*

And

And here p. 111. he maketh a very faint Attempt againſt our Plea, that *Titus* (we ſay the ſame of *Timothy*) was an Evangeliſt; which he very diſcretly, *more ſuo*, calleth *a ridiculous Subterfuge*. I ſhall examine what here he bringeth to back this Confidence; and then ſhew that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangeliſts. 1. Saith he, *It is no where ſaid in Scripture, that he was one of them who were called Evangeliſts.* *A.* He ſhould have deſcribed to us them who in Scripture are called Evangeliſts: The word is divers ways uſed in Holy Write: neither do we argue from the Name, that either he, or *Timothy* (to whom this Name is expreſly applyed, 2 *Tim.* 4. 5.) were Evangeliſts: but we argue from their Work and Circumſtances, together with the mention that is made of ſuch an Office being in the Church, in the beginning of Chriſtianity. There are others beſide them, whom we can prove to have been Evangeliſts, who, may be, get not that Name expreſly given them in the Scripture. Next he argueth, *the Work of an Evangeliſt hath nothing in its nature oppoſit to, or inconſiſtent with the Dignity and Character of either Biſhop, Presbyter, or Deacon.* What if all this were yielded? what gaineth he by it? *Titus* being an Evangeliſt might do all the Work that our Adverſaries aſcribe to him; tho he were no Biſhop, and tho his being a Biſhop were not inconſiſtent with being an Evangeliſt; what we deſign is, that doing ſuch Work doth not prove him to have been a Biſhop; ſeing he was an Evangeliſt; who hath all that power that *Titus* is ſaid to have. Beſide, *Saravia* (who hath ſaid more for Epiſcopacy than this Author hath) *de Miniſtr. Evang. grad. C. p.* Saith *nam quemadmodum major Apoſtoli authoritas fuit quam Evangeliſtæ, & Prophetæ & Evangeliſtæ major quam Epiſcopi vel Presbyteri, ita Titi & Timothei, qui Presbyteri & Epiſcopi erant, major fuit authoritas quam Presbyterorum quos oppidatim Apoſtolica authoritate crearant.* He maketh Evangeliſts to be a higher degree than the Biſhops; if then *Titus* was an Evangeliſt, is it imaginable that he was afterward degraded to be a Biſhop? Do we ever read that an Apoſtle was turned to an Evangeliſt; or a Biſhop to a Presbyter; or he to a Deacon: unleſs ſome of theſe were degraded for ſome fault. Wherefore if *Titus* had the Character of an Evangeliſt, it is not like he was ſetled at *Crete* as an ordinary Biſhop. Further he deſcribeth an Evangeliſt; out of *Euſeb. lib. 3. C. 37. hiſt. Eccleſ.* That *he is a perſon that preached the Goſpel to ſuch as had not before heard of it; at leaſt were not converted by it.* *Euſebius* is not by him fairly cited, C. 33. (not 37.) he is giving account of ſuch as builded the Churches planted by the Apoſtles (as his own words bear; therefore they did

not

not only preach to them who had not heard the Gospel) he saith *they fulfilled the Work of Evangelists, that is* (saith he) *they preach Christ to them who as yet heard not of the Doctrine of Faith; and published earnestly the Doctrine of the Holy Gospel.* Which sheweth that *Eusebius* calleth them Evangelists, whom the Apostles imployed to Water their Plantations (as *Apollo* did after *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 6.) also whom they sent to preach to the Unconverted; or any way to preach the Gospel. His *at last* is his own addition to *Eusebius*, not the words of that Historian. It is evident then, that *Eusebius* hath said nothing that can exclude *Titus* from being an Evangelist. I do not deny that any ordained Minister may preach the Gospel to Infidels, and on that account be called an Evangelist, in a large sense; as may also every on that preaches the Gospel: but we now speak of an Evangelist in the more restricted sense, as it signifieth a Church Officer whom Christ had set in his Church, distinguished from Apostles, Prophets, Pastors, Teachers, *&c.* *Eph.* 4. 11. That it is no where insinuated that *Titus* was such an Evangelist, he alledged *p.* 111. but we prove from the Work he was imployed about, that it is more than insinuated. He proveth that one may do the Work of an Evangelist who is much higher than an Evangelist (which is a Truth, but very impertinent to his purpose) becaufe *Daniel did the Work of the King; who was no King but much lower than a King: a very wise Consequence indeed;* That *Philip the Evangelist had no power to confirm, or ordain, he affirmeth, p.* 112. which is both false; he had power to ordain when any of the Apostles sent him about that Work: and *Timothy* and *Titus* had it not otherwise. (For the power of Confirmation, we know none had it: there being no such Ordinance, in our Authors sense, in the Apostolick Church) It is also wide from this purpose, for the Apostles might send the Evangelists clothed with what power they thought fit to impart to them. *Paul* might send *Titus* to *Crete* to ordain Elders, and *Philip* might be sent elsewhere, on another Errand; and yet both be Evangelists. That most of the Primitive Bishops were Evangelists, is true, in the large sense, as before: but not in the strick sense: neither is this to our present purpose: for he saith nothing unless he can also make it appear that all the Evangelists, in the Primitive Times, were Bishops. But what followeth is wholly false: that *any Bishop or Presbyter, who now adays converteth any Jew or Pagan, are as properly Evangelists as any of them who were so called in the Primitive Times.* If it were so, every such Minister should be a Church Officer of a distinct sort from all other Church Officers; for there were whom the Scripture

ture doth particularly call Evangelists, *Eph.* 4. 11. as so distinguished.

§ 16. That we may more fully and distinctly take off what our Adversaries pretend to bring for *Timothy* and *Titus* being Bishops; and not Evangelists; I shal shew what is the true Notion of an Evangelist; whence it will appear plainly, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were such: and that there is no ground from what is said of them in Scripture to think, that they were ordinary Officers in the Church, or Diocesan Bishops. I deny not that the word Evangelist is sometimes taken for any Preacher of the Gospel, who bringeth the good News of Salvation to Mens Ears. Yet it is often taken ἐξαιρετῶς, for, 1. One who wrote the History of the Life and Death of Christ; and that by the infallible Guidence of the Spirit; and so *Matthew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, and *John* are called Evangelists. 2. For an extraordinary Officer who was imployed by the Apostles for planting Churches, and propagating the Gospel. That there was such an Officer distinct from all others, both extraordinary, or temporary, and ordinary, or permanent, is evident from that place already cited, *Eph.* 4. 11. Our work is then to enquire what is the distinguishing Character of this Church Officer, from all others. Also that some are called Evangelists peculiarly, and by way of Distinction from other Officers of the Church, as *Philip*, *Acts* 21. 8. Of whom *Grotius in locum*, saith, *qui cum olim de numero Diaconorum fuisset, factus est Presbyter περιοδευτης, nulli certæ Ecclesiæ affixus; quales Evangelistæ vocabantur*, *Eph:* 4. 11. 2 *Tim.* 4. 5. i. e. מְבַשְּׂרִים *Esai.* 40. 9. and 51. 7. *Ita solent promotiones fieri* Κατὰ Βάθμον, 1 *Tim:* 3: 17. Let us then see what Light we can get in this matter from Scripture, or from Antiquity, or by the help of later Writers. The Scripture not only giveth us account (as hath been said) that there was such an Officer in the Church; but that some were sent hither and thither by the Apostles, and that about such a Work as could not be done but by Apostolick Authority; as is evident in *Timothy* (as is shewed §. 12.) and *Titus*; whom *Paul* made his Companion in his Travels, *Gal:* 2. Whose Journeys and Imployments the Reader may satisfie himself about, from *Smectym:* §: 3: *p:* 38. (That I may shun the pains of Transcribing) *Tichycus*, *Sosthenes*, *Luke*, *&c.* several of them are mentioned by *Euseb: hist: lib:* 3: C: 33. It is evident that these Men can be Ranked into no other Class of Church Officers, neither ordinary nor extraordinary. Wherefore they must be Evangelists: and from the account that we have of them, we must gather what was the Power, the Work, and the Characteristick Note, of an Evangelist

gelist, that *he was an extraordinary Officer in the Church, needful for the first planting and setling of the Churches, who was imployed by the Apostles, and by them authorized to do what ever work, or exerce what Acts of Power, the Apostles themselves, who imployed them, might have done.*

§ 17. For what account of them is to be found among the Ancients, it is to the same purpose: they make them no fixed Officer, but itinerant. They ascribe to them Apostolick Power; and make them subordinat to, and delegated by the Apostles; for this see *Euseb: hist: lib:* 3: C: 33: (or as some editions have it 37:) who telleth us of some who Αποδήμιας στελλόμενοι ἔργον ἐτελοῦν εὐαγγελίστων: *being sent Abroad, performed the Work of an Evangelist*: and this Work of Evangelists he sheweth to have been, *preaching the Gospel, planting the Faith in strange Places, and ordaining other Pastors, committing to them the Labouring* (γεωργίαν) *of them who were newly brought in*: and he addeth, *that they themselves went to other Countreys and People*, ἑτέρας χώρας καὶ ἔθνη μετιέναι. Can there be a more lively Description of Evangelists, in the Notion that Presbyterians have of them: *Euseb:* also *hist: lib:* 5: C: 9: speaking of *Pantæus*, that he was sent as far as *Judea*, he hath these words πόλλοι ἦσαν εὐαγγελίστων, *&c. There were many of the Evangelists, who had a great Zeal after the manner of the Apostles* (Ἀποστολικοῦ μιμήματος) *to promote the Heavenly Word, and to plant it*, and these Evangelists, he saith, *they were prepared of purpose*, which relateth to the Divine Institution of this Office. *Augustine de tempore, Serm.* 146 calleth the Evangelists, *suppares Apostolorum*: which setteth them in very nigh degree to the Apostles, and far above the ordinary Bishops: with which if we compare *Council: Chalcedon*: which saith, that *it is Sacriledge to set a Bishop in the degree of a Presbyter*; they should more count it Sacriledge so to degrade an Evangelist, as to set him in the degree of a Bishop, or an ordinary Pastor in the Church, *Chrysost: in Eph.* 4. Τρίτον εὐαγγελίσται οἱ μὲν περιιόντες ------ 3*ly*, *Evangelists who went about every where preaching the Gospel, as Priscilla and Aquila.* Later Divines, both of the Episcopal and Presbyterian side, tread in the same steps. *Grotius* not only is clearly for this Notion of Evangelist, on *Acts* 21: 8: above cited; but on 2 *Tim:* 4: 5: he calleth them, *adjutores Apostolorum*; quæ (saith he) *magna sane dignitas, Scultet: & Piscat: in* 2 *Tim.* 4. *Evangelistæ proprie dicti erant, tempore Apostolorum, qui itinerum eorundam & laborum socii erant, qui ad diversas missi sunt Ecclesias, ut fundamenta jacerent, quales Philippus, Sylvanus, & alii. Estius in Eph.* 4. 11. saith, *they were præditi singulari dono Evangelium predicandi. Grotius*, and *Hamond* on the same

same Text, they were *adjutores, vel comites Apostolorum.* From all this it may be concluded, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Evangelists in the strict sense of that word: and considering the nature of their Office, and their Travels mentioned in the Scripture, they were not fixed to any particular Charge: and consequently were not Bishops, in the sense that we use that word. If my Adversary will prove them to be Bishops, he must bring Arguments to prove their Office to have been ordinary and permanent in the Church; and that they were fixed in a particular Pastoral Relation, each to some Flock: which is no ways done by what he hath yet said.

§ 18. I now proceed with my Antagonist, who *p.* 112. bringeth a new Argument, *viz.* That *James the Just was Bishop of Jerusalem*, and he saith, *it is not material to his design, whether he was one of the twelve Apostles, or not*: One would think that this is more to his purpose than he is aware of: for he is proving the Succession of Bishops to the Apostles, and if *James* was an Apostle, this instance can never prove such Succession. But I pass this. I think he was one of the twelve, because he is so called, *Gal.* 1. 19. and 2. 9. *Paul* speaketh there of the Apostles in the strickest sense; for he cannot mean he had seen no Preacher of the Gospel at *Jerusalem*, save *Peter*, and that he speaketh of that *James*, who abode at *Jerusalem*, when the rest of the Apostles left it, is not to be doubted. That *James* stayed at *Jerusalem*, and did not travel as the rest of the Apostles, I have acknowledged, §. 4. and there have given account how it came to pass. That he had all the Power that our Brethren give to their Diocesan, we deny not: The Apostolate included that, and more. That he might be called a Bishop, and was sometimes so stiled, we may easily grant: for that word is sometimes used generally: for all Church Rulers, and not only Apostles, but their, and our great *Master* is so called, 1 *Pet.* 2. 25. But none of these Concessions, nor all of them in Conjunction, will prove that *James* was Bishop of *Jerusalem*, in the sense of the word that is now current; that is, that he was an ordinary Ruler of the Church, inferior to an Apostle, and an Evangelist, whose Jurisdiction was limited to one District, and not extended to all the World. Let us now hear his Proofs for *James's* Episcopacy at *Jerusalem*. 1. *It is uniformly attested by the most ancient Witnesses, particularly, Clem. Alexandr. and Hegesippus.* I can easily yield him a great many more Witnesses; and persons of more Credit than *Hegesippus*, and of more Antiquity than *Clem. Alexandr.* tho I will not yield,

that all his Adversaries grant it, in his sense. *Salmasius* (whom he citeth) saith nothing, but that *he abode at Jerusalem.* The Answer to this Argument is easie, the Ancients called *James* Bishop of *Jerusalem* (as they also called some other Apostles who abode not so long in one place) because of his Apostolical Authority which he there exercised; which included in it all that Authority that any of the Ancients (or Moderns either) ascribe to a Bishop: and usually they began their Catalogues of Succession with some Apostle, or Apostolick Man: as *Peter* at *Rome*; tho it is certain he did not reside there: and it is a Question whether ever he was there. And indeed it was usual with the Ancients to speak of things long before their time, in the Dialect that was current among themselves. His Argument from this Denomination is naught, unless he can make it appear, that *James* had his Authority, not from his Apostolate; but by his being ordained a Bishop. I wonder to find that such a Learned Man as *Downam* asserteth that *James*, before his Ordination as *Bishop*, had Authority as an Apostle; but had no Jurisdiction over that particular place; but was a Pastor *sine titulo*: for this strange fancie will infer, that *Paul* and the rest of the Apostles never had Jurisdiction any where; seing they were no where ordained *Bishops*: nor doth the Scripture give account of any such Ordination of *James*.

§. 19. We have further Argument from *p.* 113. *Peter when he was delivered out of Prison commands that these things be made known to James, Act.* 12. 17. *Where* (saith he very wisely) *the deference paid to Saint James is visible: and taken notice of elsewhere frequently, as Gal.* 1: 19. *and* 2. 1, 9. Truly the Papists have many Arguments that have a fairer shew than this hath for its Conclusion, for *Peters Supremacy.* I wonder that a Man pretending to Learning, is not ashamed of such an Argument. Was not all this respect due to *James* as an Apostle; how then doth it prove him to have been a *Bishop*: is there any thing that looketh like Jurisdiction (which yet we deny not to *James* at *Jerusalem*) cannot Men be civil to a Person so eminent for Grace, Gifts, and his Character, but they must make him a Diocesan Bishop? but the strongest Argument is yet behind: *Act.* 15. *He pronounceth the Sentence by his Episcopal Authority. A.* He might far rather do it by his Apostolick Authority: but there was no need of either of them; he did it as being chosen Moderator of that Meeting: and that he exercised no Episcopal Authority in this Case, is evident; for the rest of the Apostles were present, *Act.* 15. 2, 4, 6, 22. And it was never heard of (but among Papists) that one Apostle had Authority

rity over another, or over all the rest: much less that a Bishop should have Authority over Apostles. I am afraid this Author unawares doth so stretch the Episcopal Authority, that he will make it break, and be contemptible. He telleth us, *Calvin holdeth all that he saith, on Gal. 2: 9:* in saying that *James was preferred to Peter, because he was Hierosolymitanæ Ecclesiæ præfectus.* He disingenuously leaveth out *Calvins, fortassis*; which sheweth that he was not positive in that matter. But I shall positively yield him what *Calvin* doth but doubtingly, and let him make his best of it. Let it be granted that *James* was chosen Præses of that Meeting, because of his Residence at *Jerusalem*, and being the chief Governour of that Church where the Meeting was held, (not as Bishop but as Apostle) this can prove no Preference to any of the Apostles; Presidency in such a case doth not infer a Superiority of Power. It rather sheweth that the Apostles did not there act in their Apostolick Capacity, but in a Parity with the other Elders; with whom they are always joyned in that Chapter, when spoken of. Our Author now making a Transition to another Head of Arguments, cannot go out of his Road, in concluding with insolent Contempt of his Adversaries. *I do not* (saith he) *now insist on these imaginary and superficial Exceptions that are made by our Adversaries.* If they were such, they were well suted to some of the Arguments he hath last used.

§ 20. Another Argument he beginneth, *p.* 114. and prosecuteth it in some Pages following, is taken from the *seven Angels of the seven Asiatick Churches*; by whom he understandeth *the Bishops of these Churches*: if they were so, the Consequence is, *that Bishops were setled in the Churches by the Apostles: and that these Churches were not by Divine Right ruled by a Colledge of Presbyters.* This Argument hath been much tossed; and in my Opinion, urged with more Strength, by others of his Party, than he giveth to it. For clearing the Truth in this Matter, I shall give my Opinion, and lay down the Grounds of it; and then Examine what he saith in Enforcing and Vindicating this his Argument. I find three Opinions among the Presbyterians about these *Angels.* The first is, that by *Angel* is meant the Collective Body of the Church; for this our Author citeth *Salmasius, Walo. Messal. p.* 184. *Ambrosius Ausbertus*, is also cited by *Smectym:* and *Aretas Cæsariensis* by *Turret.* his Words are, Ἄγγελον τῇ Ἐφεσίᾳ τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ Ἐκκλησίαν λέγει, *&c.* Also *Ticonius* was of this Opinion, as is said by *August. de Doct. Christian. lib.* 3. *c.* 30. And it is certain, that not only all the Members of the Churches were concerned in what is written in

these Epistles; but *John* was commanded to write them to the Churches, *Rev.* 1. 11. And in the Conclusion of every Epistle, all the Church Members are excited to hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches, and not to the Ministers only, which yet doth not prove that by *Angel* is meant the Church: their Concernments in these times were entrusted to the *Angel*; not that they were the *Angel*. Another Opinion is that of *Beza*, *Reynolds*, and others; who take *angel* διστικῶς; for a single person; but maintain, that not a Diocesan Bishop is to be understood, but the πρόεδρος, or Moderator of the Presbytery, by whom the Epistle was to be communicated to the rest of the Pastors, and by them to the People: and indeed it is certain, that the Word may be so taken; and if we should yield this to our Brethren, it cutteth the Nerves of their Argument, unless they can prove, that these single persons had Jurisdiction over the rest of the Pastors of these Churches. Which they can never do from the Epistles themselves; for all the Reproofs and Commendations may be intended for the Colledge of Presbyters, tho addressed to them by the Praeses. Nor can the Direction of the Epistle to a single person prove what they intend: there is nothing more ordinary than to address a Community by the Praeses of their Meeting: if a Letter be Directed to the Moderator of a Presbytery for the use of the Presbytery, doth this Entitle him to Episcopal Jurisdiction? The third Opinion (to which I most incline) is, that *Angel* is here to be taken συλλογικῶς, or *Collectively*, for the Colledge of Presbyters; so that to the *Angel* is (in our Phrase) to the Moderator and remanent Brethren. In the Contents of the old Translation of the Bible (which expresseth the sense of the old Church of *England*, in this matter) they are called Ministers. So it was understood by *Aretas*, *Primasius*, *Ambrose*: *Gregory* the Great, *Beda*, *Haymo*; and many others, saith *Owen of Ordination*, C. 2. *p.* 35.

§ 21. I shall first prove that it may be so taken: next, that it must be so understood. For the former, it is usual in the Scripture, and particularly in the Mystical Parts of it; in Types and Visions (and that most of the Book of Revelation is written in that Stile, every one knoweth) to put the Singular Number for the Plural; or to mean a Multitude when but one is expressed: how often is a People or Nation expressed by the *Virgin* or *the Virgin Daughter* of such or such a Place? The *Ram*, *Daniel* 8. 3. is interpreted to be the *Kings of Media and Persia*, v. 20. The whole Succession of the Apostate Bishops of *Rome*, is called *Antichrist*, *the Man of Sin*, *the Son of Perdition*. The Antichristian Church consisting

consisting of Priests and People, is called *a Beast, the Whore*: So an inferior Number is put for a great Multitude; the Enemies of the Church are called *four Horns*, and her Deliverers *four Carpenters*, *Zech.* 1. 18, 20. The Directions given to Judges are often in the singular number, *thou shalt do so* and so: hundreds of Instances of this nature may be given Whence it is easie to conclude, that there is no Absurdity, nor is any Violence done to the Text, if by *Angel* we understand the Rulers of the Church, or the Colledge of Presbyters. My next work is to prove that *Angel* must be so understood, for which I bring these Arguments, 1. The Lord here useth a Title that doth not signifie Rule, or Jurisdiction; but Gods Messenger to the People: as also, *Rev.* 1. 16, 20. These *Angels* are called *Stars*, which importeth their Teaching, or holding forth Light to the People; both which are common to the Presbyters: seing then he doth not use a word of Authority, whereby the Bishop is pretended to be distinguished from the Presbyters; but of Embassy, and giving Light; whereby the Presbyters are distinguished from the People; this word cannot be taken for a Ruling Bishop, but for Teaching Presbyters. It were a strange thing, if our Lord designing to single out one person from all the rest of the Church, would design him by that which is common to him with many others, and not by that which is peculiar to himself. It doth also strengthen this Argument, that both in the Old and New Testament, they whom God sent to his People to reveal his Mind to them, are called *Angels*, *Jud.* 2. 1. *Hag.* 1. 13. *Mal.* 2. 7. 1 *Cor.* 11. 10. Yea the *Legions of Angels* who are imployed to Encamp about the People of God for their Safety, are called the *Angel of the Lord*, *Psal.* 34: 7.

§ 22. Argument 2. It is not without a Mystery, that *Rev.* 1: 20: our Saviour in opening the Mystery of the Vision, speaketh twice of the seven Churches; but shunneth calling the *Angels* seven: he saith not, the seven Stars are *the seven Angels of the Churches*; but *the Angels of the seven Churches*: as by the *seven Spirits*, *Rev.* 1: 4: and 3: 1: is meant the Spirit of God, sufficient for the needs of all the seven Churches; so here, the *Angels of the seven Churches* must be the Pastors whom the Lord hath provided for the use of his Churches; tho they were not one only for every Church, but more. Argument 3. It is manifest from *Acts* 20: 28: (and I have evinced it § 3. of *Sect.* 3.) that there were more Presbyters, or Bishops at *Ephesus* than one: If then Christ wrote to the Rulers of the Church of *Ephesus* under the Title of *Angel*, he could not mean a single person.

perſon. It cannot be denyed, that they who are called Overſeers of the Church of *Epheſus*, *Acts* 20: 28: are they whom Chriſt here calleth *Angel*: the ſame thing is expreſſed in the one Place in a more plain Stile, in the other in a more Obſcure and Myſtical Stile. Argument 4. Our Brethren will not deny, that there were more Church Officers imployed in Teaching each of the Churches than one Biſhop. Now theſe muſt either be comprehended under the *Candleſtick*, or under the *Star*: they cannot be a part of the *Candleſtick*; for they give Light, as the *Candleſtick* doth not, but by the *Candleſtick* is meant the People to whom the Light ſhineth: they muſt then be comprehended under the *Star*, and conſequently under the *Angel*; whence it followeth that the *Angel* is a Plurality of Perſons. So that we may conclude, that as by *Candleſtick* is underſtood the Collective Body of People, ſo by *Star*, or *Angel*, is underſtood a Body of Church Officers, and not a ſingle Biſhop. Argument 5. Many things are ſaid in theſe Epiſtles, which cannot be Expounded with reſpect to a ſingle perſon: as at *Epheſus*, the *Angels forſaking his firſt Love* is threatned with *removing the Candleſtick*: that is, Unchurching that People: can we think that ſuch a fearful Judgment could be threatned for the Sin of one Biſhop, if the reſt of the Elders and People were free: and this we muſt ſay, unleſs we acknowledge that the *Angel* to whom the Epiſtle is Directed is not a ſingle perſon, but a Community. The ſame may be ſaid of ſeveral other Churches; would the Lord *ſpue out* all the Presbyters and People of *Laodicea*, for the Hypocriſie of one Biſhop. Argument 6. There are ſeveral Paſſages in theſe Epiſtles wherein a Plurality is expreſſed; as that which is meant by *Angel*, to whom the Epiſtle is addreſſed: as *the Devil ſhall caſt ſome of you into Priſon*: can that be Expounded, ſome of thee Biſhop of *Smyrna*, or ſome of your Paſtors, and People? and *unto you I ſay, ὑμῖν, and the reſt in Thyatira*: is not there a plain Intimation of a Plurality, under the Name of the *Angel*? by *the reſt in Thyatira* muſt needs be underſtood them who are diſtinct from the *Angel*, and the *Angel* muſt be who ever is diſtinct from theſe who are called *the reſt*? and yet beſide *the reſt*, there is a Plurality, *you*. My Antagoniſt hath an Anſwer to this Paſſage, ſuch as it is; which I ſhall conſider, when I come to Examine his Vindication of his Argument. *Smectym. Sect.* 13. out of *Fox*, *Meditation on the Revelation* (which I have not ſeen) citeth *Auguſt. Ep.* 132. *Sic enim* (ſaith he) *in Apocalypſi legimus, Angelus, &c. Quod ſi de Angelo ſuperiorum Cœlorum, & non de præpoſito Eccleſiæ velit intelligi, non conſequenter dicat habeo adverſum te, &c.* And

Homil.

Haimi. 1. in Apocalyp. Quod autem dicit Angelo Thyatiræ, habeo adversum te pauca, dicit præpositis Ecclesiarum. And *Greg. moral. lib. 34. in Job 4. Sæpè sacra Scriptura prædicatores Ecclesiæ, pro eo quod Patris gloriam annuncient, Angelorum nomine solere designare: & hinc est quod Joannes in Apocalypsi septem Ecclesiis scribens, Angelis Ecclesiarum loquitur, id est, prædicatoribus populorum.* Also *Primasius, Haymo, Beda, Richardus, Thomas,* and others are cited by Mr. *Fox,* to this purpose.

§ 23. I shall now examine what my Adversary bringeth, offensively, or defensively, for his Opinion about these *Angels,* 1. He falleth on *Walo Meßalinus,* who *p.* 184. interpreteth *Angel,* by *Church*: calling *V. G.* the *Angel* of *Ephesus, the Church of Ephesus*; and he giveth the reason, because the Christians in each of these Towns were *puriar & sanctior pars urbis, atque adeo magis spiritualis*; therefore that part was compared to an *Angel.* Tho I do not owne this Notion of the Learned *Salmasius,* yet I judge our Authors calling it a *silly Subterfuge,* and his ridiculing of it, to be pretty ridiculous: he maketh the meaning be, *the seven Stars are the Angels of the seven Churches, that is, the Churches of the seven Churches.* By his favour, it hath no such sense (*Salmasius* can hardly be Taxed with Nonsense, even by Men of more Critical Skill than this Author is) it should be thus Paraphrased, the seven Angels are the Churches of the seven Towns: and it is evident, that according to the Opinion of that Learned Writer, the *Angels* are not distinguished from the Churches, but from the Towns wherein they were. Also, when the Epistle is addressed to the *Angel* of the Church of *Ephesus,* the meaning is not, to the Church of the Church of *Ephesus*; but to the Church which is at *Ephesus*: even as the *Virgin Daughter of Israel,* is not the Nation of the Nation of *Israel*; but that Nation which is called *Israel.* Mystical Expressions must not be strained by Critical Wits: some Atheists, by this method, have endeavoured to draw Nonsense out of the most Profound, and Instructive Parts of Scripture. Our Author hath not dealt very fairly with *Salmasius,* in this matter; for he understandeth by *Angel,* the Church Guides *signanter,* and also the whole Church; his words are, *per Ecclesiam* (having said that *Angelus* was *Ecclesia*) *non tantum Ecclesiasticum ordinem intellexit Joannes, sed universum in quaque civitate fidelem populum, ut mos est Apostolis loqui.* And if he will ridicule *Salmasius,* the same Censure must fall on *Aretas* Bishop of *Cesarea Cappadociæ,* whom *Salmasius* citeth, *p.* 183. Discoursing at large to the same purpose. I cannot understand what he designeth by telling us, *p.* 115. That the Church cannot

cannot be called a Company, a Multitude, or a Colledge of Angels but one ſingle *Angel* præſiding in their Eccleſiaſtical Meetings. For no Man doth ſo ſenſe the word; but by *Angel* ſome underſtand a Multitude of People, others a Plurality of Elders; but none of them make *Angel* to be a Multitude of *Angels*.

§ 24. He next telleth us, that *tho there be Inſtructions in theſe Epiſtles in which others are concerned, yet the Epiſtles are no leſs to ſingle Angels, than the Epiſtle to the* Philippians *is to the whole Church there, tho particular Compellations he uſed, as, I intreat thee true Yoke Fellow, Ch.* 4. Here is an odd Conſequence, there is an Apoſtrophe uſed to a ſingle perſon, in an Epiſtle expreſly Directed to a Community, and that in plain and proper Language, *Ergo*, when in a Myſtical Speech an Epiſtle is Directed in the ſingular Number, in a borrowed Term, we may not underſtand a Plurality, tho when the Writer of the Epiſtle ſpeaketh more properly, he ſpeaks expreſly to a Plurality. What tho the Concluſion of the *ſecond Epiſtle to Timothy* had been to a Plurality; doth it thence follow, that a Myſtical Word in the ſingular Number, may not be Plurally taken? the contrary would ſeem to follow more natively. But he is guilty of a double Miſtake here, one is, that the Concluſion of that Epiſtle is to all the Faithful; the laſt words are, *The Lord Jeſus Chriſt be with thy ſpirit; grace be with you* Where he is mentioned expreſly as the Perſon to whom the Epiſtle is Directed: and the People of God with him are remembred alſo expreſly: it is not alike, when the Word is uſed in the Direction of an Epiſtle, which, tho ſingular, is capable of a plural Senſe; and in the Epiſtle a Plurality is expreſly ſpoken to. His next Fancy is moſt groundleſs. that the Biſhops of the *Aſiatick* Churches are called *Angels* in Imitation of the *High Prieſt*, who was Dignified with that Name: and for this he citeth *Mal.* 2. at the 7. *v.* For tho we ſhould grant that מלאך may be Tranſlated *Angel*, as well as *Meſſenger*; yet this is a Deſcription of the Prieſts Work and Authority, telling us what he is; it is not a Name by which he uſed to be Deſigned. Again, what Warrant is there to ſay, that this is meant of the *High Prieſt* peculiarly? it is evidently to be underſtood of Prieſts in common: the Prieſt, that is, every Prieſt. For *Deut.* 27. 9, 10, 11. (whence that Axiom ſeemeth to be taken) Aſcribeth this Priviledge to a Plurality of Prieſts; and not to the *High Prieſt* alone. Further, it is a bad Conſequence, the *High Prieſt* was called an *Angel*, and the Church Rulers are called *Angels*, *Ergo*, every one of them had the ſame Juriſdiction that he had: this is a looſe way

of

of Schooling; and either will fix the *Pope* in his Chair, or is Insignificant. He hinteth (very superficially, and obscurely) an Answer to one of our Exceptions, *p.* 116. That *the Faults of the Churches are imputed to the Angels, because they had Spiritual Power to reform them.* Reply, it cannot be so understood; for some of the Faults are such as no Church Discipline can reach, nor any Ministerial Care prevent, or amend: as having *a name to live when they are dead*; Hypocrisie is not properly the Object of Church Censures: but such Scandal as are the Symptoms of it: nor are Ministers always to blame when the Word doth not make People sincere. That this Hypocrisie was the Fault of the People as well as of the Angel, may be gathered from *v.* 4. where *a few*, and only *a few*, in that Church, are excepted from that blame. I add, that not only the *Angel* is blamed for the Faults of the Church; but the Church is threatned for the Fault of the *Angel*: if the Epistle be Directed to him in his single Capacity.

§ 25. He hath a peculiar Answer to what we alledge from *Rev.* 2. 24. *To you, and to the rest in Thyatira.* 1. He borroweth an Answer from Doctor *Hamond* against *Blondel*, who not only blameth our Translation, but the Greek; which he alledgeth to be corrupted, by adding, Και: he would have it read *to you, the rest of Thyatira.* His ground is, *the most ancient Manuscripts; particularly, that of Alexandria, preserved in the Royal Library, hath not this* Και. *Ans.* It is Confidence enough, if it be also Candor, to pretend to the Countenance of the most of the ancient Manuscripts, when but one can be instanced. *Grotius*, *Ribera*, and *Beza*, mention but three, which is far from the most part; and *Beza* proveth the ordinary reading out of *Aretas*. I oppose to this bold Pretence, the Collections of various Readings made by *Curcellæus* (who hath, with no good Design toward the Scripture, gathered together what he could meet with; and may be more than ever were extant) where this is not to be found. Also the Laborious Work of the Learned and Industrious *Walton*, who in the *Appendix to his Biblia Polyglotta*, hath gathered the various Readings out of most ancient Manuscripts: (which he there nameth) and not a word of these in any of them. Likewise the Operose Notes of *Lucas Brugensis*, (in the fore-mentioned Appendix) where nothing of this appeareth. If his one Manuscript, be enough to Overballance all the Manuscripts, and Printed Copies extant, let the Reader judge. Because he could not but jealous this Shift as insufficient to his purpose, he hath a second Answer, which supposeth our Reading of the

Text to be right: that *you*, *you*, *relateth to all the Churches of Asia*, *which had been spoken of in the former v*. This is his own Invention, and let him have the praise of it, (Doctor *Ham. in loc.* maketh *the rest* to be the other Cities under *Thyatira* the Metropolis, which is better sense: but without all ground, unless what is in Question be yielded to him:) his Party may applaud his Zeal, which will rather Distort the Scripture, and turn it to Nonsense, than not defend the Dignity of Bishops. For what sense could it make, I will make all the Churches of *Asia* to know that I search the Reins and Hearts; but to you, the Churches of *Asia*, and to the rest in *Thyatira*, I say: these of *Thyatira* were a part of the Churches of *Asia*; how then can they be called *the rest*, as distinguished from them. Beside, he had been speaking of the Churches of *Asia* in the third person: It were then strange, if with the same breath he should speak to them in the second person. I insist not on his calling *Beza's* sense of the *Angel*, that a Præses is meant, *ridiculous, and contrary to the sense of all Antiquity*; such Confidence and Contempt are the Flowers of his Rhetorick. Neither doth *Beza* speak of *a Weekly, or Monethly Moderator*, but pleadeth against his being perpetual: which this Author should have opposed with Reason, or Scripture, not with Taunts. We make no Argument of the *seven Angels* not being called Bishops: his refuting of it is idle work. That *Polycarp* was then Bishop of *Smyrna* (as he said p. 118.) is no more certain than that *Timothy* was then Bishop of *Ephesus*: and if the Good that is said of *Smyrna*, suite to the one History, the Ill that is said of *Ephesus*, will as ill agree to the other. He telleth us of *the Explications of the Sectaries* (the Presbyterians) *being spoiled by comparing the Epistle to the Angel of Smyrna with the most ancient Acts of the Martyrdom of Polycarp*. But hath not thought fit to point at the Arguments that arise from this Comparison; wherefore he cannot expect that we should Answer them: which might easily be done, if they be no stronger than what he hath hitherto brought from Antiquity.

§ 26. He hath now fallen on an easie way to determine the whole Question, p. 118. It is pity it came not sooner, that all this Labour might have been saved. But it may be this Birth also may miscarry. *Parturiunt montes*, —— the Question seemeth to me to be in the same State, and his Opinion to labour under the same Difficulties, as before this Invention was hatched. His easie way lieth in three Enquiries, *Whether the Ancients affirmed that the Apostolical Power was derived to the Bishops as their Successors*. 2. *Whether they insist frequently on this Succession of single Persons to the Apostles in particular Sees, when they reason*

reason against Heretickes 2. *Whether we may not with Safety and Confidence lean on their Authority, and Tradition, in an Affair of this Consequence?* If ye will give our Enquirer leave to Dictat magisterially the Answers to these three Questions, our whole Debate will soon, but not soundly, be at an end: but if we contest every one of them (in his sense) with him, we cannot so soon conclude this Dispute as he imagineth: For his first Enquiry, it must not be made, nor the matter determined so indistinctly as he doth. It is not denyed that Bishops succeeded to the Apostles; but the Question is, whether these Bishops had the same Jurisdiction over Presbyters and People, that the Apostles had? The Ancients sometimes, with the Scripture, called all Presbyters Bishops; sometimes, by a Custom that early crept into the Church, they restricted that Name to the Præses in the Meeting of Presbyters: and the Question is, whether this Præses had the Apostolick Power in his single person, or it was diffused equally among the Members of that Colledge in which he did præside? This being premised as the state of this Question about Succession to the Apostles; I hold, that all that Apostolick Power that was needful for the Churches once planted, and must be continued to the end, was communicated, not to the Præses alone, but also to the rest of the Presbyters: and that all of them were the Apostles Successors, in that respect: he is for the contrary Opinion.

§ 27. Let us now hear his Reasons, Two things he brings for Arguments, or what else I do not well know. One is, *It is evident that the Ancients affirmed that the Apostolical Power was derived to the Bishops as their Successors, from the Catalogue of Bishops in the Apostolick Sees, by the most ancient Records of the Church.* This is no dreadful Argument: for, 1. Among all the Sees he mentioneth (I need not transcribe them) there is not one in which an *Apostle* was said to sit, but that of *Jerusalem*: the rest indeed were excellent Men who first præsided in these Churches: but not *Apostles*; and therefore their Sees can no more be called Apostolick, than that of *Canterbury* or *York*, *&c.* whose Bishops this Author reckoneth to be the Apostles Successors, tho not so immediatly as those mentioned. 2. These Catalogues that he mentioneth, were not so early made as he would insinuat: they do indeed begin with early things, and guess at what past in, or near, the Apostles Times: but we do not find that such Co[illegible]ion of the Succession of Bishops was made for near three hundred yea[illegible]er Christ; except some little account by *Irenæus*: and these that ar[illegible]nt, are so perplext, and do so disagree with one another,

ther, that nothing can be concluded from them, with any certainty: particularly in the Succession at *Rome*, there is no certainty that *Peter* was there, nor who were after him; the same might be shewed of others of them. 3. No more can be proved from these Catalogues, but that in the first Ages of the Church, there were such men who Ruled and Taught these Churches, whom after Ages called Bishops: but the Catalogues neither tell us what Power they had; nor whether they ruled these Churches alone, or in Parity with the rest of the Presbyters. As *Gr. Bucer* expresseth it, *p.* 423. *Non quæritur an Episcopi continua successione usque ad Nicenum Concilium Ecclesias gubernaverint, sed quales Episcopi fuerunt, & quid imperii aut potestatis in Ecclesiam aut Presbyterium habuerunt.* That one only is mentioned is no proof of sole power: for, 1. That is not always done, *Irenæus lib.* 3. *c.* 3. beginneth the Succession at *Rome* with *Peter* and *Paul*. 2. In their Catalogues they mentioned the Eldest, or the Præses of their Meeting, or the Man of most Fame for Grace or Gifts. For their Design was not to number all the Pastors of the Churches; but to shew a Succession of Pastors, and of sound Doctrine. Neither do we find such Records of Succession in all Churches, but in some that were of most Note.

§ 28. His second Enquiry and Observation, *p.* 119. is, *In what Language the Ancients spake of* Bishops, *who are said to have succeeded to the Apostles*: where he bringeth a number of Citations litle to the purpose in hand. His first is *Irenæus*: *Et habemus annumerare eos qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, & successores eorum usque ad nos, qui nihil tale docuerunt, neque cognoverunt, quale ab his deliratur.* What can be hence inferred, further than that there were Sound and Orthodox Men, whom *Irenæus* calleth Bishops, from the Apostles time: which is not to our Question. That *Irenæus* Reasons from this against the *Valentinians*, is not probative of our Authors point: what he addeth out of *Irenæus*, *Quos* (*Episcopi*) *& successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum locum Magisterii tradentes*; is not concludent: for, 1. This is not spoken of a single Bishop in one place; but of all the Pastors of the Churches: whom we maintain to have been a Plurality. 2. Or this *Magisterium* may well be understood of their Teaching Authority; for that was to his purpose; that they whom the Apostles Authorized to Teach the Church, Taught not the Doctrine of the *Valentinians*. For what he saith that *Irenæus* carefully distinguishes between Bishops and Presbyters, he hath cited no place for it: and if he had, it importeth no more, but that special notice was taken of the Præses,

Presbs, beyond the rest of the Presbyters: it can never prove sole, nor superior Jurisdiction. Another Citation out of *Irenæus* (that I may not transcribe all the words) is no more, but that *Apostoli illis tradiderunt Ecclesias*: which we deny not: seing it may be understood of all Presbyters: and indeed *Irenæus* saith the same of Presbyters, *lib.* 4. *C.* 43. Only our Author will have it understood of Bishops, because of their Age: on the contrary, *I* plead, that it should be understaod of Presbyters by Office? because Preaching Power was committed to them, and not to Bishops only: and it is of that he is speaking; as that by which the *Valentinian*, and other Heresies were condemned. Another Testimony out of *Irenæus*, we must obey them *qui successionem habent ab Apostolis —— qui cum Episcopatus successione Charisma veritatis certum, secundum placitum Dei acceperunt.* *I* see nothing to prove that all this may not be applyed to every Presbyter, or Pastor of the Church; nor is there any Shadow of Ground for his Inference, *viz.* *Ye see here, that the Episcopal and Apostolical Dignity are one and the same, in the Language of Irenæus.* None can see this, unless the Eyes of his mind be Tinctured with prejudice. For 1. *Episcopatus successio* is competent to all Presbyters, in our Opinion: which he should refute, not suppose it to be false. 2. Here is not the Apostolical Dignity mentioned by *Irenæus*, but a part of it, to wit *Charisma veritatis certum*; which *I* think he will not say is peculiar to Diocesans: the Church would be ill served, if they only had the Gift of Preaching the Truth: seing they cannot preach to all their People: and in our days seldom preach to any of them. He bringeth another wonderful Argument, which he speaks of as what may supersede his insisting on what he is discoursing: *the Prophesy* (saith he) *which threatned that the Bishoprick possessed by a notorious Malefactor should be given to another, was literally fulfilled when Matthias was advanced to the Apostolate, in the Room of Judas.* *I* am so slow as that *I* cannot perceive what he aimeth at by this, unless he would infer, *Matthias* succeeded to *Judas*, *Ergo*, the Bishops, and they alone, succeed to the Apostles: which is much more ridiculous, than what he a litle before he charged *Beza* with. If he lay stress on the word *Bishoprick*, it is *captio ab homonymia.*

§ 29. *Cyprian* is the next Father whom he adduceth, as a Witness that the Bishops succeed to the Apostles. All that he bringeth from the Writings of that Learned Father, and Holy Martyr, I have lately Answered, in a Debate on this Subject, with *J. S.* I am not willing to repeat: yet I shall point at Answers to what he citeth. *Cyprian* saith,

Apostoli,

Apostolos, id est, Episcopos & Præpositos, Dominus elegit. His Objection hath its own Answer: *Cyprian* distinguisheth between *Episcopos & Præpositos*: the President Bishop and the Presbyter; and he calleth them both Apostles; because they succeeded to the Apostles. I hope he will not make *Præpositos* to be Exegetick of *Apostolos*, least he make *Cyprians* sense to be, *Apostolos, i. e. Episcopos, i. e. Præpositos.* Another Citation, *quod enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensa Domini, quando aliqui de Presbyteris nec Evangelii, nec loci sui memores, neque futurum Dei judicium, neque unum sibi Præpositum Episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub Antecessoribus nostris factum est, totum sibi vendicant.* This may seem plausible to such as know not the occasion of these words; which was: while *Cyprian* was retired from *Carthage*, because of the Persecution, some of the Presbyters, without the rest, took on them to absolve some of the Lapsed: this *Cyprian* complaineth of, as justly he might; yea, he had cause to complain, that their Bishop (that is, constant Moderator of their Presbytery) was neglected in this matter; for that cause should have been determined in *consessu Presbyterorum*; which should have been called together by him; as *Præpositus illis*, that is, by their Choice, made the constant Præses of their Meeting: There is no proof here of a solitude of Power: nor of *Cyprians* Succession to the Apostles (which is the thing that our Author citeth it for) more than the rest of the Presbyters did. The special notice that is here taken of his being neglected, proceeded from the Genius of that Age, wherein perpetual Presidency had set the Bishop a little higher in Dignity above the Presbyters, than they had been from the beginning. Another Citation (which also misseth the mark, *viz.* Succession to the Apostles) is, that *Cyprian* saith, *Ecclesia super Episcopos constituitur, & omnis actus Ecclesiæ per eosdem gubernatur*; and saith, this is *Divina lege fundatum.* All this may be understood of Scripture Bishops, that is, all the Presbyters: and if ye will take it of the *Cyprianick* Bishop, that is, the Præses, we assent to it as truth; provided we understand not these Bishops in their single Capacity, but in Conjunction with their Presbyters: the Church is set on all Pastors who teach sound Doctrine, with respect to her Soundness in the Faith, and Edification in Holiness: on the Presbytery, or ruling part, (among whom, in *Cyprians* time, the Præses, or Bishop, was specially taken notice of, tho he did not rule by himself) with respect to her good Order: and that all this is *Juris Divini*, I no way doubt. If our Author can make out sole Jurisdiction from these words, he must bring better

Arguments

Arguments than I have yet seen. Again, *Cyprian* saith, the Bishops succeeded to the Apostles *vicario ordinatione*. This is also granted, and may be understood of all Pastors of the Church; and we deny it not of the *præsides Presbyteriorum*, who were peculiarly called Bishops: they succeeded to the Apostles as Ministers of the Gospel; but that they either had the plenitude of Apostolick Power, or that their Presidency, as a distinct Office, or superior Degree, was by Succession from the Apostles, we deny; and it is not proved from *Cyprians* words. Their ruling power they have, with the rest, by Divine, or Apostolick Institution: that there be a Presidency, is of the Law of Nature; and hath Scripture example; the person who should preside, is to be chosen by common consent; nor do we find any warrant from Scripture, either that he should have power superior to the rest, or that this Presidency should always be in one person. He bringeth also *Tertullian*, saying, *percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Episcoporum suis locis præsident: habes Corinthum, habes Ephesum, habes Romam.* This Testimony importeth no more than that there continueth in the Churches, planted by the Apostles, a Government to this day. *Cathedræ* cannot be strained to signifie a Bishop with sole Jurisdiction: the Notion of that word is sufficiently Answered by a Judicature in the Church, where one presideth: which we say should be in every Church. He is so confident of his Conclusion, that he desireth us *to read* Cyprian *himself* (we do it, Sir, and think not fit to take all on Trust that is cried out of him by your Party) and he thinketh *the Disingenuity of* Blondel, *and his Associats will appear to the highest Degree.* I desire, on the other hand, that he would read him with an *Un*byassed Mind, and then all this Airy Confidence will evanish. That he asserteth, p. 123. that *the Authority of Bishops over Presbyters, Deacons, and Laity, will appear to them who read Cyprian*, is denyed, except in the sense that I yielded in the Book above pointed at: they have joynt power with the rest of the Consistory over one another, and over the whole Church.

§ 30. I proceed with him p. 123. to his second Enquiry: *Whether the Ancients insisted frequently on this Succession of single Persons to the Apostles in particular Sees, in their Reasoning against Hereticks.* I acknowledge that they frequently Reasoned from the Doctrine that had been taught by persons succeeding to the Apostles in particular Churches: and that they named particular Men, or single Persons in that Succession: but that they laid any weight on their being single Persons whom they so named;

named; or that they lookt on these as the only Successors of the Apo-
stles in these Churches, we deny; and have not yet seen it proved. It
is the same thing, as to the Strength of their Reasoning, whether they
Minister, or more, had the Power of Governing these Churches. There-
fore, if we should yield him all that he is here enquiring for, it doth
not advantage his Cause, nor hurt ours; unless it be made appear that
the single persons so named, were the sole, or supreme Rulers in the
Churches: which I am well assured is not proved by any of the Testi-
monies that he bringeth. His first Citation is out of *Tertull.* whose Ar-
gument is plainly this, that the Hereticks could not shew the beginning
of their Churches, as the Orthodox could do, from persons placed there
by the Apostles; as *Polycarp* was by *John* at *Smyrna*, and others in other
places: and he addeth, *perinde utique & cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apostolis*
in Episcopatum constitutos Apostolici seminis traduces habeant. Here is not
one word of Singularity of Power: and it is certain, that *the Apostolical*
Seed of sound Doctrine might be transmitted to Posterity by a Plurality of
Presbyters, as well as by single Bishops: yea, and better too; for if one
erred, the rest might correct him; but if the Bishop erred, there was
none in that Church that might oppose him. That *Polycarp* in *Smyrna*
and none else, is named, doth not prove that he alone Preached the
true Doctrine, and far less that he Governed that Church by himself.
And indeed the Zeal and Unanimity that he mentioneth p. 125. was a
good mean of keeping the Doctrine of the Church pure: but as this Una-
nimity could not be in one Church, but among a Plurality of Teach-
ers, so the Unanimity of a few Bishops in several Dioceses, could not
be so convincing in this matter, as that, with the Unanimity of Presby-
ters among themselves in these several Churches that they were to in-
struct. Another Testimony of *Tertull.* he bringeth, *Ordo tamen Epis-*
porum ad originem recensus in Joannem stabit autborem. There is nothing
here but what hath been already Answered: there was an Order, or
Succession of Bishops, whereof *John* the Apostle was the Appointer of
the first of them: but he doth not tell us of their sole Jurisdiction. He
argueth p. 126. that *if the imaginable Interval of Parity had been known, after*
the Apostles, and the Succession of single Bishops interrupted, this Argument had
been weak, and the Hereticks might have insulted. A. I deny that either
he, or the Hereticks could have any such advantage: because the Fa-
thers did not argue from the Singularity of the Persons succeeding one
to another, they had no occasion to consider that, in this Debate; for
the

their claim to instance in one person so succeeding in a Church, where there were more: it was enough to confound the Hereticks, that such Doctrine was constantly taught since the Apostles days, and they could tell them by whom. What followeth *p.* 126, 127. is a Repetition of the same thing: about which I shall trouble him no more, let him tell it over again as oft as he will. He needed not tell us *p.* 128. that *the Successions of single Persons Governing particular Churches, and their Jurisdiction and Preheminence, is acknowledged by some of the Gallican Church*; we know there are Worthy Men in that Church; but we never thought them all infallible.

§ 31. His third Enquiry is, *Whether we may safely lean on the Authority of the Ancients, in an Affair of this Consequence?* he saith, *no doubt we may; and ought.* I affirm that this matter may admit both of further Distinction, and of some Doubting: and that it is blind Confidence to be so positive, without clearing the State of the Question. And there is the more need of distinguishing in this Case, because our Author seemeth, in pursuing this his Enquiry, to confound two different Questions: one is, whether we may lean to the Accounts they give of the Succession of Bishops since the Apostles days? Another is, about the Antiquity of Episcopal Government, as he wordeth it, *p.* 131. It is one thing to owne a Succession of Teachers in a Church, whome some Men will call Bishops; another to owne that the Government of the Church was managed by them alone. I shall here propose and apply five Distinctions. 1. The Ancients and their Writings are to be distinguished. Some of them lived in, or near to the Apostolick times: others of them some Ages after: the Credibility of the former, *cæteris paribus*, is far greater than that of the later: Because they had better *causam scientiæ*; and because, tho Tradition, without Writing, may, at first, and under the best advantages, soon, and easily be corrupted; yet by length of time, and passing through many hands, it is more apt to be depraved; and that even without design. For the Writings ascribed to the Ancients, some of them are Spurious, and only bear the Names of Famous Men. Others of them are corrupted, and interpolated; tho they were really done by them whose Names they bear: others of them are Dubious; so that it is *sub judice*, whether they be credible Testimonies, or not. A second Distinction is, of the things about which we debate. our Author indeed doth distinguish, in the Progress of the Debate, between *Matters of Fact, and Matters of Opinion, or Principle*: of which afterward,

terward. I distinguish things on which our Faith, or our Duty do depend; from these things that we are not so concerned in, being meerly Historical Passages, or Debates about Natural or Politick Things: in Matters of Fact of the later sort, we are to believe the Fathers as credible Historians; and regard them (at least some of them) as Men of Learning; yet so as not to believe their Histories, nor receive their Conclusions against Sense and Reason: for the former sort of things, I look on their Testimony as insufficient, to perswade the Mind, or clear the Conscience: Scripture, not the Fathers, must be the Rule of our Faith, and Religious Practice. Distinction third, These things that we Debate about, are either determined in Scripture, or not: if not, much regard is to be had to these Holy and Learned Men; who had much of the Mind of God in many things: yet, as was said before, we must not blindly follow them, over the Belly of Sense or Reason. If they be, Scripture light must be our Guide, not the Opinion of the Fathers. Distinction fourth, The Testimony of the Fathers is either Unanimous, or they are Divided: in the later case, we cannot follow them; but must examine which of their Opinions is best founded. In the former, their Testimony may occasion a great prejudice, and may readily byas the Mind; yet it should not determine us against Scripture Light, they all being fallible Men. Distinction fifth, The Opinions of the Fathers are either clearly delivered, or we must guess at them, from dark Hints. As the one sort can no way command our Faith: so neither the other is to be received implicitly.

§ 32. Out of these Distinctions, this State of the present Question resulteth, whether the Testimonies of the Fathers be a sufficient ground on which we may determine, whether Episcopacy or Parity be the Government of the Church that Christ hath instituted. My Antagonist is for the Affirmative, I am for the negative: for which I give these Reasons, 1. We have no concurrent, nor unanimous Testimony of the Fathers on either side; for all the noise that is made of the *Universality* and Perpetuity of this Tradition, and *Unanimity* about it. If they can prove what they confidently affirm in this point, we shall quit this Argument. Many of the Fathers have said nothing on this head: few of them have have written on it directly, and of purpose; and what they have said, is but indirectly, without considering the State of our Controversie; which I am perswaded, was not brought into Debate in the Primitive Times: many of the Excellent Men of the first Ages have written

written nothing: many of the Writings of that time are perished; there are different Opinions in this Debate among them, whose Writings we have; which arose from the Change of the Practice that had been in the Apostolick Age: whence then should we have this Harmony that they talk of? for this last (the rest are certain enough) I refer the Reader to what hath already been said in this Disputation. 2. What most of the Fathers say on this head, is obscure, and hard to be understood: their Expressions being suted to the Customs and Dialect of that time, which was plain enough to them who then lived; but not so to us, who know not their Idioms, nor the Customs that they relate to, as then known things: they also used words in a far different sense than we do: As *Merit*, *Pennance*, *Bishop*, and such like. It is sometimes far easier to clear the Point in Debate from Scripture, and Reason, than to clear the Expressions of some of the Fathers about it. 3. The Uncertainty that we are at about the Genuine, and Spurious; the Pure and Corrupted Writings of the Fathers, make their Testimony unsafe to be the solitary ground of our Faith, or Practice, even in this matter. Who knoweth not what Debates are among Learned Men on this Head? and how Conjectural all the Knowledge is that can be attained by the most diligent Search? And surely it is no Wisdom to build our Opinion in a Matter of Religion, wherein we either please God, or sin against him, on such a Sandy Foundation: Of this Opinion was *Theophilus Antiochenus* who flourished about *an.* 130. and is said to be *Sextus a Petro*, in the Church of *Antiochia*, *lib.* 3. *ad Autolycum*, near the beginning: he is shewing the Certainty of what Christians believed; compared with the Stories about the Heathen Gods, and hath these words, ἐχρῆν τοὺς συγγραφέντας, *&c.* i. e. *It was needful that Writers should be Eye Witnesses of what they affirmed: or that they have exactly learned the truth of things from them who were present when they were done: for they who write Uncertainties that they themselves know not, do as it were, beat the Air*: his work is to be found *Biblioth. Patr. T.* 2. This Passage is, *p.* 151. of the *Cologn* Edition 1618. 4. It is acknowledged by the best Antiquaries, that the History of the Ages of the Church next to the Apostles, is defective, dark, and uncertain: This is not only found now, at this distance of time; but it was early complained of by *Eusebius*, who had far more help to a certain and distinct knowledge of these things, than we have, *lib.* 3. C. 4. ὅσοι δὲ τοῦ τῶν, καὶ τίνες γνήσιοι —— *But how many, and what sincere Followers* (or Successors) *have Governed the Churches*

planted by the Apostles, it cannot be confirmed, but so far as may be gathered out of the words of Paul. Where he layeth the Certainty of our Knowledge of what concerneth the Government of the Church, on Scripture, and not on the Fathers. And in his Preface to his History, he telleth us, he had *gone in a Solitary and Untroden Path, and could no where find so much as the bare Steps of such as had passed the same Way; having only some small Tokens* σμικρας προφασεις *here and there, as it were.* Also, that *he had not found any Ecclesiastical Writer, who unto this day* (and it was the Interval of three hundred years) *have in this behalf* (he is speaking of the Succession of Bishops) *imployed any Diligence.* Is there not then great Certainty to be expected from this, or any other Writer, concerning these times; that we should look on their Accounts as sufficient ground to build our Faith on, in a matter that Religion is so nearly concerned in? The Learned *Scalliger* hath this Observation to our purpose: *Intervallum illud ob ultimo capite actorum Apostolorum ad medium Trajani imperium, quo tractu Quadratus, & Ignatius florebant, plane cum Varrone* Ἀδήλον *vocari potest, in quo nihil certi de rebus Christianorum ad nos pervenit, præter admodum pauca, quæ hostes pietatis obiter delibant, Swetonius, Tacitus, Plinius; quem hiatum ut expleret Eusebius,* εκ των ὑποθεσιων *Clementis, nescio cujus, (non enim est ille eruditus Alexandrinus,* ὁ στρωματευς) καὶ εκ της πενταβιβλου *Hegesippi, non melioris scriptoris, sine delectu ea deprompsit. Tilenus* (no Friend to Presbytery) saith full as much; he telleth us of the *Lacunæ* and *Hiatus* of these times: and that *a fine actorum Apostolorum, ad Trajani tempora, nihil habemus certi.* Shall we then take the broken and uncertain Accounts that we find of these times, for a sufficient Foundation of our Faith, about what is the Will of God concerning the Government of his House.

§. 33. Our fifth Argument we take from the Fathers disowning each himself, and all others, beside the Prophets and Apostles, from having sufficient Authority to determine in the Controversies of Religion; not exempting that about Church Government. This our Writers have made so evident against the Papists, that it is a wonder that Protestants should use such a Plea. And indeed the Papists get much advantage by this Conduct: for the same Arguments that our Author, and his Complices, use in this Debate, they improve in the other Controversies; and with the same advantage. For if the Scripture be not sufficient Light to us in this, I see not how it can be thought perfect in some other of our Debates: if unwritten Traditions be found necessary in the

one case, it will be hard to lay the same aside in some others. I have adduced some Testimonies of Fathers to this purpose, *Preface to* Cyprianick *Bishop Examined*: to which I shall now add, *August. lib. 2. contr Manichæ.* of the Scriptures he saith, 161. *Si quid velut absurdum noverit non licet dicere, author hujus libri non tenuit veritatem; sed aut codex mendosus est, aut interpres erravit, aut tu non intelligis. In opusculis autem posteriorum, quæ libris innumerabilibus continentur, sed nullo modo illi sacratissimæ Scripturarum Canonicarum excellentiæ coæquantur, etiam in quibusdam eorum invenitur par veritas, longe tamen est impar authoritas. Jerom* is much, and often in this strain, *Ep. 62. ad Theoph. Alexandr. Scio me aliter habere Apostolos, aliter reliquos tractatores: illos semper vera dicere, istos in quibusdam ut homines errare: Et Ep. 76. Ego Originem propter eruditionem sic interdum legendum arbitror, quo modo Tertull. Novatum, Arnob. & nonnullos scriptores Ecclesiasticos, ut bona eorum eligamus, evitemusque contraria; juxta Apostolum dicentem, omnia probate, quod bonum est eligite.* The same he saith also of his own Writings, *in Hab. & Zech. Si quis melius, imo, verius dixerit, & nos libenter melioribus acquiescemus. Ambros. de incarnatione, C. 3. Nolo nobis credatur; non ego dico a me, quia in principio erat verbum; sed audio, non ego affingo, sed lego, &c. Cyril. Hierosol. Cat. 12. Meis commentis* ἐυρεσιλόγιαις *non attende; possis enim forte decipi: sed nisi de singulis Prophetarum testimonia acceperis ne credas dictis, &c.* Yea, the Papists themselves reject the Authority of the Fathers when they please, and teach in general, that they are not always to be followed: as *Dally* and *Turretin* shew, out of *Cajeton, Canus, Maldonate, Petavius*, and *Baronius*, who often reprehendeth the Fathers, even in the Historical Accounts they give of Matters of Fact: and doth not this very Author so far forget himself, as to say, that *Jerom* erred in his account of the practice of the Apostolick Age, *p.* 73. as I above observed: and if *Jerom* did mistake, why might not the rest also, the Opinion of the Learned and Excellent *Bradward. de Causa Dei, lib. 2. C. 3. corroll. p.* 601, 602. is consonant to what I have said.

He

He sheweth, that the Fathers did often seem, at least, to favour Heresies: particularly *Pelagius*: and *p.* 602. *E. Et quis theologus nesciat alias scripturas quorumcunque scriptorum non tanta firmitate semper munitas, sed posse quandoque ab hominibus emendari*, and instanceth in *Origen*, *Jerom*, *Cyprian*, and *Augustin*. Our Authors Exception against this, in his Distinction of Matters of Opinion, and Matters of History, that the Fathers might mistake in the one not in the other, I am afterward to consider.

§ 34. For further Confirmation of this Truth, I shall transcribe a few heads of Arguments, out of a *Manuscript* written by a Learned Divine of this Church; Entituled, *Some Propositions collected out of the Writings of Divines about Church Government*: because few can have access to read the Manuscript it self: He proveth, 1. That the Testimony of the ancient *Historians* is not in every thing, and particularly in that point of the *Hierarchy*, probably true, because, 1. Even Episcopal Writers of the best Note, deny their Testimony to be universally true: *Sutliv. de Pontiff. lib.* 2. *C.* 11. *p.* 148. *Multa de Petro & Paulo & aliis sanctis hominibus narrantur fabulosè, quibus nemo necessario tenetur credere*: *ibid. p.* 153. About *Peters* being at *Rome*, *Ad testimonia Patrum quod attinet expedita est Responsio*: *quæ fama acceperant, narrant, sed dubia & incerta*. *Whitaker* of *Peter* and *Pauls* being buried at *Rome*, *Hoc totum nititur fidei humanæ, & ex historiæ veritate pendet*: *at fides & Religio nostra certiori fundamento nititur; testimonio, scil. spiritus sancti*: *Bar. Pref. p.* 3. *Nulla res hactenus in Ecclesia magis neglegi visa est quam Ecclesiasticarum rerum narratio*: *quod si Historias consules, magnam eorum classem ex intelliget, quæ absque delectu perceperunt, & aniles fabulas*. 2. They relate many things that are generally disbelieved, as the Letter of *Abgarus* to *Christ*, and *Christs* Answer: *Peter* being twenty five years at *Rome*, as Bishop of that Church, is questioned by most Protestants; *Sutliv.* saith, *Credo eum Romam nunquam vidisse*. *Reynold*, *Calla.* with *Hart*, bringeth strong proofs that *Mark* was not Bishop of *Alexandria*. 3. Many of these old *Histories* are lost, as that of *Egesippus*, as *Bellarmine* confesseth: others are vitiated, some carelesly written, as *Socrates* testifieth of *Eusebius's* History, *lib.* 1. *C.* 1. That *he took more care to praise the Emperor, than to describe the Acts of that time.* Also several things are in *Eusebius* which he did not write, for he citeth *Sozomen*, *lib.* 3. *C.* 20. who lived an hundred years after him. 4. The Testimony of most Ancients about the *Hierarchy*, is *in causa propria*. 5. Many of them whose Testimony is brought, lived an hundred years after the Apostles times: and therefore had things by Tradition, which useth to grow by being often rehearsed;

for,

for, saith Socrates, *lib.* 5, C. 9. *Nulla fabula narratur bis quin duplo major emendet.* 6. The Testimonies of the Ancients in this are not harmonious. *He* further proveth. 2. That these Testimonies cannot found a Theological Conclusion: For, 1. They are no part of the Canon of Scripture, on which ground Protestants reject Testimonies from Apocrypha. 2. Their Writings contain some things that neither Party assenteth to. 3. Their Sayings were not probative in their own time, *Ergo*, neither in ours; seing we and they have the same ground of Faith. 4. A Theologick Conclusion must be built not on Topick, or uncertain grounds: *Reynold Colla.* with *Hart*, C. 6. *Præter authores sacros nullus Historicus certus esse potest, i. e. Idoneus ad faciendam fidem in Theologia.* *Sarav. de Pontif. l.* 2. *p.* 151. *Quis Ecclesiæ status fuerit antequam Apostoli tradiderunt rationem gubernandi Ecclesiam, nemo dicere potest, nisi ex sacris scripturis.* *Sutliv.* 12. *T.* *Probatur nostra sententia* (that Peter was not at Rome,) 1. *Quia nusquam ex scripturis probatur, nihil ejus scripsit in Epistolis suis Petrus, nihil Paulus, nihil Lucas, qui res Apostolorum diligenter prosecutus est.* A Theologick Conclusion must either be founded on some evident and clear Demonstration, or some infallible Authority: neither of which is in the Sayings of the Ancients for the Hierarchy.

§ 35. Let us now hear what he bringeth for this his Opinion; where in he is so positive and confident: one might here expect strong Reasons; but behold, *pro auro paleas.* He telleth us, *p.* 128, 129. *The Apostolical Churches had their own Fasti, in which were recorded the Succession of their Bishops, and the Names of the Martyrs: and that there are many Apostolical Monuments beside: in which Egesippus, &c. could not be mistaken.* *A.* 1. *Euseb.* was of a contrary Opinion: he could find none of these *Fasti*: but was forced to *go in an untroden Path*, as *I* shewed §. 31. 2. *He* should have given some evidence for this confident Assertion: for we know not where to find these *Fasti*, without his Direction. *I* deny not that in some after Ages they began to keep Records in Churches; but that in the Apostolick and next succeeding Age, they had them, we find not: and these are times of which we, with *Eusebius*, and others, complain of, as to the *Uncertainty* and Defectiveness of History. 3. The Memory of the Martyrs was early Recorded: we do not find that the Succession of Bishops was so. 4. Suppose the Records of both had been early and exactly kept, this can give no Light in the present Debate, unless they had Recorded what Jurisdiction they whom they called Bishops did exercise: which he doth not so much as allodge out of

these

these *Fasti*. 5. *It* is confessed by all, that *Hegesippus* was a very Fabulous Author, and took many things on Trust, which he neither found in the *Fasti*, nor any Apostolical Monuments. For *Irenæus* and *Tertull.* they say nothing for his Cause but what we are ready to contest with him; even supposing their Authority to be as great as he will make it. For *Clement*, he is mistaken about him, as *I* shewed before, out of *Scripture*.

§ 36. Next he advanceth a Distinction (and ingeminateth it) of *Theorems and Matters Fact*: he confesseth, *in the former that the Ancients might mistake; but not in the latter*: that *it is impossible that they should mistake, and they would not impose upon Posterity; seing such things were obvious to the Knowledge and Observation of the meanest Christians: we must not think that they Lied in these, or Conspired to propagate a Lie to Posterity: for they were Men of such Sanctity, defended the Truth with their Blood, many of them had miraculous Gifts; they were Unanimous in delivering this their Testimony.* A few Considerations will easily dissipate this Mist, 1. *He* supposeth the *Unanimity* of the Ancients bearing Testimony to Episcopacy being the way setled by the Apostles: which is utterly denyed: he taketh it also for granted, that that was universally practised in, and since the Apostolick Age, till of late: which is also said without all ground; if he will prove either of these, we shall insist no more on either Argument or Defences from Antiquity. *If* he will take it for certain, and despise all that we bring out of the Fathers, and all our Exceptions to what he and his Party bring; we must leave it to the Judicious Reader to believe as he seeth cause. 2. *He* doth most unreasonably suppose, that, if we think the Testimonies of the Fathers was insufficient to determine us in that matter, that therefore *we impute Lieing to them*; or that they designed to impose upon Posterity. For one may mistake, and misrepresent a *History*, and yet not lie, or design to deceive others: because he speaketh as he thinketh; the Error is in his *Understanding*, not in his Will. Doth this Author think that *Jerom* told a Lie, or designed to impose on others in that wherein he imputeth Error to him, as is above said; *I* suppose he will not owne such Thoughts of that *Holy* and Learned Person: wherefore it is most absurd to impute to us that we count some of the Fathers, yea, or all of them, Liars, because we think they might err, even in Matter of Fact: *It* is well known that Matters of Fact are frequently misapprehended, and thence misrepresented, even by them who would be loath to tell a Lie: if this were so; *I* could prove him, and some others of his Party, to be notable Liars; which

will

will be far from asserting: is there not much false History of things done in the time when they are reported or written; much more it may be so at great distance of time, when Reports pass through many hands, *vireſque acquirunt eundo.* Wherefore the Sanctity, Zeal for Truth, and other Excellencies of the Fathers are no ways impeached by rejecting them as insufficient to be the Rule of our Faith, or Practice, in the things that concern Religion. 3. For the Miraculous Gifts of the Fathers, about whose Testimony we now Debate, I think he will find it hard to prove them. I deny not that some extraordinary Gifts did continue in the Church some time after the Apostles, but can this Author tell us who had them, or that the Fathers who have left Writings behind them were so Gifted? Beside, their Gifts, if they had such as he alledgeth, could not prove what he intendeth, unless he could make it appear that they had such infallible assistance as the Apostles had: which I think he will not attempt to prove.

§ 37. I fourthly observe on this part of his Discourse, that his Distinction is wholly impertinent to this purpose; and that the Fathers were capable to be deceived in this Matter of Fact, no less than some Theorems, or Matter of Principle: because, 1. This matter doth contain in it a *Principle*, or *Theorem*, *viz.* That Episcopacy was instituted by the Apostles: now this might arise from misinterpreting some Passages of the Apostolick Writings: if they say the Church was governed by Bishops in the Apostles time, which is Matter of Fact: they must also say it was appointed by the Apostles, which is Matter of *Jus* or a *Theological Theorem*: and this must depend on their understanding some Passages of Scripture, as holding forth that Truth. For Example, *I left thee in Crete, unto the Angel of Epheſus*, and such like: now they might misunderstand some other Scriptures as is confessed; why not these also. None of the Fathers is so positive as to say that he saw a Bishop exercising sole Jurisdiction in the Apostles time: wherefore their Assertion of the *Factum* (if any such there be) must have been built on their Misapprehensions of the *Jus*: and if they be not infallible in the one, they could not be so in the other. 2. This *Factum*, that Bishops alone governed the Church, and not Presbyters with them, (for that is our Question) and that in, and next after the Apostles times, must come to all, or at least to most of the Fathers by Tradition: for none of them could see the Practice of the Church in all these Ages, about which we dispute: but Tradition is very lyable to lead People into Error, as every

and knoweth: If the Fathers might mistake about what is written in the Scripture, as is confessed, how much more might they err in that which they have but by Tradition; which their Fathers have told them, and which is not so Recorded in Scripture, but that they might misapprehend it? 3. Whereas our Author, p. 130. ascribeth Fallibility to the Fathers in Doctrines and Theorems, because *these might depend on their Ratiocinative and Intellectual Faculties, and they had no Priviledge against Errour of that Nature*: may not the same be said of this Matter of Fact, that we now debate about? the Management of Church Government is such a thing as a Man cannot understand, nor rightly apprehend merely by Sense, and without the use of Ratiocination. How can we understand what is the Power and Jurisdiction of one Man over others, without inferring it from the Acts we see him do, with respect to them? I find my Antagonist often out in his Reasoning in this very thing. He readeth of a Bishop set in a higher Seat than the Presbyters; Church Acts spoken of as done by him, without mentioning the Presbyters: he findeth in Catalogues of Successions in Churches one mentioned and no more; and such like: here his *Intellectual and Ratiocinative Faculty* inferreth, that one Bishop ruled these Churches, and the rest of the Presbyters had no hand in the Government, further than advising: here is ill Logick and false Reasoning: and in that he will not say that he is infallible. It cannot then be denyed, but that the Fathers behoved thus to reason from what they saw and heard: if then they might err in the use of their *Intellectual and Ratiocinative Faculty*, what should hinder but that they might err in this matter: which maketh his Distinction wholly void. His saith, p. 131. *We must either receive this Historical Truth, or say that no Age, or no Society of Men in any Age, can transmit the Knowledge of any Matter of Fact to the next Generation.* A. 1. It is not absurd to say, that no Humane History about Matters of Fact can so transmit what was done in former Ages, as to be a sufficient Foundation for our Faith or Practice, in any part of Religion, without, or contrary to Scripture; tho it may give ground for a Historical Certainty in things that are not of that Concernment. To apply this, we maintain that Episcopacy is beside, and contrary to the Scripture (and if he will beat us out of that Hold, we shall yield him the Fathers) wherefore, if all the Fathers in one Voice, and that plainly and positively, would say (which yet they have never done) that Episcopacy is of Divine Right, we are not obliged to believe it, because we know they may err, and the Scripture cannot

not arr. 2. The Consequence is naught. There are Matters of Fact that are purely such; that Men see, or hear; and cannot mistake about them, if their Sense be sound, and other Requisits to right Sensation be not wanting: these may be so transmitted by Humane History, to Posterity, that we need not fear to be deceived about them; but have a Moral Certainty: but it doth not hence follow, that such Matters of Fact, as must be known, not only by Sensation, but Conjoyned Reasoning, can be so transmitted to Posterity, by mere Humane Testimony, as that we are obliged on that Testimony alone, to build an Opinion, or engage in a Practice, that Religion is so nearly concerned in, as it is in the Matter under Debate. The Ordinances that we owne, must have surer ground than is necessary for many Historical Truths, that we do not, nor ought to Question.

§ 38. He affirmeth, p. 131, 132. that *Episcopacy was from the beginning, by Divine Authority, a Copy of the Jewish Economy, transmitted from the Apostles to single Successors, perpetually to be preserved in all Ages*: that *it was uniformly setled by the Apostles in all Churches.* All this he hath said over and over again: but hath not proved one word of it. Neither is any thing here said to our present purpose, unless he prove that the Testimony of the Fathers alone, is a sufficient ground for us to believe all this: for that is the present Debate. He saith, *nothing is answered to all this, but that they* (the Presbyterians) *say the Ancients were Erroneous in several things.* And is that nothing? I have shewed that they were no more under infallible Conduct in this, than in other things. That *they who transmitted to us the Knowledge of the Polity setled by the Apostles, were sufficiently acquainted with the Apostolical Constitutions, and that these Customs and Constitutions were not only preserved in the Ecclesiastical Records, but conveyed to their Eyes in the dayly Practice of the Church*: this he affirmeth, p. 133. I suppose to prove that the Testimony of the Fathers alone is sufficient ground for our Faith, that Episcopacy is *Juris Divini.* Most of this is already Answered, being but a Repetition of what he hath said before. I further *A.* 1. These Fathers were acquainted with the Apostolical Constitutions by their Writings (for he will not say that they were Eye Witnesses to Apostolick Practices; tho it is alledged that one of them saw *John* the Apostle; that will not prove such acquaintance with his, or other Apostles way) we have their Writings, as well as they had; and seing it is confessed, that they were not infallible in Understanding and Expounding Scripture, it is reasonable that we should

see with our own Eyes, and not with theirs, and we should not implicitly believe the Fathers in telling us that the Apostles meant so and so in their Writings. 2. We think the Apostolick Constitutions are best preserved, and most purely, yea infallibly, in the Apostolick Writings, these are the Ecclesiastical Records that we lay more weight on than the *Facts* of the Churches that he saith, were in the after Ages. 3. That the dayly practice of the Church did convey to the Eyes of the Fathers the Constitutions of the Apostles, we utterly deny: for Practice and Institution are two different things: for the one is not always a good commentary on the other: even in the Apostles times, the *Mystery of iniquity* began to work, Practice began to vary from Institution: and in the very thing we now speak of, there were Efforts to carry Practice beyond the Rule, when *Diotrephes* did φιλοπρωτεύειν, affected to be *primus Presbyter*: and we may rationally think, that this Ferment did (when the Apostles were gone off the Stage) gather strength among Men who were not so humble, nor mortified as they should have been. Practice doth often degenerate from Principles (as we see in dayly Experience) and it is probable that this very thing might deceive some of these Holy Men, and make them judge a miss of the Apostolick Constitution; and consequently make their Sentiments no safe Rule for our Guidence in this Matter. Beside all this, we cannot yield that the Practice of the Church was such as our Author fancieth, in the times of the first of the Fathers: or, that they do so represent the Practice of the Church as he imagineth. He insinuateth another Argument, *p.* 134. That *the Fathers found the Series of single Successors in all the Apostolical Churches, governing Ecclesiastical Affairs, and this Succession not asserted as a thing that was then opposed, but rather supposed*; and inferreth, that *a Tradition so stated, and conveyed, is as Authentick and Infallible as any thing of that Nature can be. A.* That the Fathers found this, or that they asserted it, is denyed: what he else where bringeth for proof of this is answered. Again, if the Fathers had found this, they had erred: we maintain that they were Men capable to mistake, and to find what was not to be found. Further, it is not probative, that the Fathers did not find this way opposed, but supposed: both because the Degeneracy from the Apostolick Constitution that there was in the Primitive Church came in insensibly; it wrought as a *Mystery*, unobserved, 2 *Thess.* 2. 7. (I do not understand that Scripture exclusively of other things, but inclusively of this) and were as the *Tares, when Men Sleep*. Also because, if there were Opposition made, it might be suppressed,

and not transmitted to Posterity, by the Influence of the Party which had the Ascendent. Yet for all this; we deny that the Fathers of the first Ages had that Jurisdiction of Bishops that he talketh of to oppose, or that it was in their days.

§ 39. What followeth, p. 134, 135, 136. seemeth to be designed as a *Herculean* Argument: it is brought from *the dangerous Consequence they run upon, who derogate from the Authority of this Traditional Conveyance, in a Matter of Fact: for by the same reason, we must question the most Sacred things in our Religion.* And for an Instance of this, he sheweth that *the Canon of the Scripture was not universally received before the Death of the Apostles, but some Books questioned, these Books were received upon Search made by the Church, and finding that they were agreeable to the Apostolick Standard; and that the Original Conveyance of such Books was supported by the Testimony of Apostolical Persons, or Holy Men who Conversed with such. If we receive some Books of Scripture on the Testimony of the Ancients, how dare we dispute their Fidelity in a Matter of Fact, relating to the Polity of the Church? So that, on the whole Matter, either we must receive their Testimonies in this, or we must question the Authority of some Books now received into the Canon: for it may be objected against this last Tradition, that it was so opposed by Men of great Name, but the other was always universally received:* I have heard that A. M. D. D. hath been jealoused as inclining to Popery, tho his Accusers failed in their Probation: he here (and in some other Passages of this Book) seemeth to prove what they could not make out. This *Medium* *Stapleton*, and many others of the *Romish* Doctors, use, to prove that the Church, not the Scripture, is the Ground of our Faith, because without the Church we cannot know which Books of Scripture are Genuine, and which are Spurious: just as this Author telleth us, we cannot know this but on the accurate Search made by the Church; upon which Scrutiny some books are received into the Canon which at first were doubted of. I advise him to read *Whitaker* against *Stapleton*; especially his *Duplicatio*: *lib.* 2. *C.* 26. where this Controversie is solidly handled, as it is also in many other Protestant Writers. It is observable that Popery and Prelacy must be defended by the same Arguments: and that this Author hath no better Evidence for, nor firmer Faith of the Divinity of the Scriptures, than he hath of Episcopacy: that his Faith in both is built on the Authority of the Church. I mention the Divinity of the Scriptures, because the whole of it is made up of its Parts, the several Books; and if our Belief, that this Book is a part of the Canon, *Ex Gr.* *Ruth*;

Ruth; be built on the Churches Authority, so it must be with another Book, and another, and so of them all. I must here then digress a little from defending Presbytery to the Defence of Protestantism, against this my Antagonist. Let me not here be mistaken, as thinking that our Certainty of the Christian Doctrine in general, were no greater than that we have about this or that Book of Scripture being Canonical: We have sufficient, though not equal Certainty of both: Or as holding that the Authenticknes of the several Books of Scripture were alike evident: some of them bear more manifest Marks of Divinity, or Motives of Credibility, than others do: And yet in them all, there is what may satisfie us, that they are from God. Or thirdly, As of Opinion that the Testimonies of the Christians of the first Ages are of no use, not Conducive to our Certainty in this Matter: I owne with *Chemnit. exam. Concil. Trident. pt.* 1. *p.* 86. That as *Scriptura habet authoritatem principaliter, a spiritu sancto; deinde a Scriptoribus*, so, *postea a Primitiva Ecclesia tanquam teste.* No doubt the Concurrent and Harmonious Testimony of the first Ages is a strong Plea: but we rest not on that Ground alone: for if we did, our Faith should be resolved into the Authority of fallible Man: Yea, we should reject some of these Books, which we now receive as Canonical; which were for some time questioned: we affirm then against this Author, that the Books of Scripture were not received by the Church, upon the Testimony of Men singly: Which he either must mean, or his Argument is not to the purpose. I argue then against him out of his own words; the Church having made an *accurate Search* into the Doctrine of these Books, and finding it was agreeable to the Apostolick Standard, and that the Original Conveyance of such Books was supported by the Testimony of Apostolick Persons, or other Men, *&c.* Here himself doth not make the Testimony of the Fathers a sufficient ground of our receiving these Books: but what the Church found in them by Searching: So that indeed he overturneth the Sufficiency of the Foundation that he would have us build on, by laying another beside it. If he will let us see Episcopacy to be suteable to the Apostolick Standard, we shall embrace it; but cannot owne it without that, tho all the Fathers in one Voice, should plead for it. Again, the Church after her Scrutiny; and these Apostolick and Holy Men who bare Testimony to the Conveyance of these Books, either had some ground for owning them as Divine, or none; but because they thought so, the latter I hope he will not say: if he say the former, we shall receive these

Books,

Books, not on their sole Authority; but on these Grounds that they went upon. If he say the present Church received them from the Church of former Ages, he must needs fist somewhere, and not proceed *in infinitum*. Whatever Person or Church he fist in, the Argument recurreth with respect to them. Further, if we receive the Books of Scripture because of the Testimony of the Church, our Faith, both of their being from God, and of the Truths contained in them, must be resolved ultimatly into the Veracity of fallible Men; and not into the Veracity and Authority of the Infallible God: unless he will make the Church infallible, as his Complices in this Opinion do: and even that will not help him, seing this Infallibility cannot be proved. And if it could, I ask whether these infallible Persons, who, after the Apostles, searched what Books were Authentick, had the Knowledge of this by Means, or by Revelation? the latter the Papists do not pretend; the former will serve us, using the same Means for this Knowledge. Lastly, I ask, whether they who conveyed these Books to us could be deceived, or not? The latter he will not assert, for he hath told us they may be deceived about *Theorems*, and that such a Book is Canonical, is such: if they could be deceived, it is not fit for us to build our Faith of a thing of so high Concernment on their Opinion. I conclude, that the Books of Scripture are *αὐτοπιστοι*, and our Faith that they are Gods Word is built, not on the Testimony of the Church; but on the Veracity of God who speaketh: and we know that God speaketh in them, from the Motives of Credibility that the Scripture it self affordeth; of which our Writers against the Papists bring not a few. If he can give as good grounds for Episcopacy as we can give for the Books of Scripture being the Word of God, we shall receive the one as well as the other.

§ 40. His next Work, which beginneth *p.* 136. is to *consider the Concessions of the Learned Presbyterians in this Controversie: which yield some Propositions that not only shake, but quite overturn the whole Fabrick of the new Doctrine.* It is well that there are some Learned Men among them: he sometimes speaketh of them, without Exception or Discrimination, in another Strain: and even here, what he giveth with the one hand, he taketh away with the other: for it is no great Evidence of Learning for to overturn the whole of what one taketh pains to build. I, in the Entrance of this Contest with him, must enter my Protestation, that I will not owne any Proposition, tho advanced by the Learnedest of the Presbyterians, that hath *a mischievous Tendency*: and if any such Asserti-

on

on ſhould happen to drop from me, upon Admonition and ſufficient Inſtruction, I ſhall retract it; *errare poſſum, hæreticus eſſe nolo.* He begin-neth with *Salmaſius, Walo, Meſſal.* p. 7. confeſſing, that *even the ancient times (except the Apoſtolick Age) diſtinguiſhed between Biſhop and Presbyter.* I acknowledge the ſame, and require this Author to ſhew how this overturneth the Fabrick of Presbyterianiſm, which he reckoneth the *Doctrine.* The Ancients early made difference in the Name; reſerving that of Biſhop to the πρῶτος, or Moderator; ſoon after, there was a difference made in their Dignity: but we deny that there was, in the firſt Antiquity, any difference in the matter of Juriſdiction: and ſo our Principle ſtandeth firm, for all this Conceſſion. What he next citeth, out of the ſame Author, p. 17. is ſo far from his purpoſe, that it ſheweth little Skill, or Conſideration at leaſt, that he mentioneth it: *Salmaſius* ſaith, *the Apoſtles ſometimes called themſelves Biſhops and Presbyters, that they might put the Honour on them to whom they committed the care of the Churches, to ſeem to be equal to them.* May not this be meant of Presbyters, as well as Biſhops, that the Apoſtles ſo honoured them. For our Argument from the Confuſion of Names of Biſhop, and Presbyter, which he thinks is here overturned: the Reader, before he come this length, will ſee this Cavill to be groundleſs; if he conſider how we manage that Argument. He citeth him alſo ſaying, that *the Ancients called Timothy Biſhop of Epheſus, and Apoſtle.* I have above ſhewed in what ſenſe both theſe are ſpoken, without any Inconveniency to our Cauſe, ſee *Sect.* 2. §. 3. It is as little to his purpoſe, that he further citeth from *Salmaſius*, that he ſaith *James, whom the Ancients ſay was ordained Biſhop of Jeruſalem, was over the leſſer Biſhops, as now one Biſhop is over many Presbyters.* He was over the Biſhops that is Presbyters, in the Quality of an Apoſtle: that the Ancients called him a Biſhop, I have ſhewed how that is to be underſtood, in the place laſt cited. He is at him again, in his p. 181. of *Walo Meſſal.* that he confeſſeth *the Form of Government was changed after the Death of Peter, and Paul, tho not ſoon after; yet in the end of the firſt Century, and beginning of the ſecond.* If *Salmaſius* mean (as I am confident he doth) that a Change unto perpetual a Præſidency, and Majority of Dignity and Notice, did then begin to creep in, I confeſs the ſame: but our Author make his beſt advantage of it: if he think that Biſhops were then ſet up with ſole or ſuperior Juriſdiction, I diſſent from him: tho even this would not overturn our Cauſe, which is built on Scripture, not on the Opinion or Practice of the Ancients that were after the Apoſtles.

§ 41. He next, *p.* 138. brings some concessions of *Blondel, apol. p.* 3. that *Episcopacy of one over many Presbyters did not prevail before the year,* 140. This is a foul misrepresentation: *Blondel* is there speaking of the Divisions, in which one said, *I am of Paul, &c.* after the manner of the *Corinthians*; that this could not be proved to be before the year 140. Now it is probable that Episcopacy, as the supposed remedy, was not presently applied on the first appearance of the Malady: but that other means were used. *Blondel* saith, *Pref. p.* 76. that *in great Cities, where were many Thousands of Christians, they had but one Church*; this saith our Author, *could not be without a Bishop over them.* Which I deny: the contrarie is ordinary at this day: all the Congregations may be under one Presbyterie, and their Moderator; which in that place he calleth *unicum concessum.* in some places many Meetings are counted one Parochial Church; which I cannot so well understand. Yet neither way overturneth Presbyterie; nor doth necessarily infer Episcopacy. He next Citeth *Bocharti Phaleg.* which is a Mistake; the Words are in his Epistle to *Dr. Morley P. mihi* 34. nor are his Words fully Cited: he expresly assenteth to *Jerome, Apostolorum ætate inter Episcopos & Presbyteros nihil fuisse discriminis; & communi Presbyterorum Concilio Ecclesias fuisse administratas:* then follow the Words Cited by the *Enquirer*, asserting the antiquity of Episcopacie. And a little after, *proinde tam qui Presbyterialem, quam qui Episcopalem ordinem juris Divini esse asserunt, videntur* τοὺς ἀνθέλκους ἀμετρία τοῦ μέσου δι' ἁμάρτειν. So that it is plain that *Bochart* saith as little for his Cause as for ours; Seing both are for a *jus Divinum.* So that *if all whom he hath mentioned were sitting in Council* (it is his own conceit) *we should have two for his one, and allow Bocharts* suffrage to be, *non liquet.* And let him raise what *Batteries* he will on this ground, which he saith the Adversary yieldeth (supposing fondly four men who lived in Presbyterian Churches, to be the whole Partie; and that some of them said what they never thought.) His first *Batterie* is, a Question P. 140 *& seqq; Seing that Episcopy was the Government all over the Christian Church toward the beginning of the Second Centurie, quo molimine, quibus machinis, was the Ecclesiastical paritie of Presbyters (which the Apostles left the Church in Possession of) changed from that æquality into Prelacie,* and here he hath a long harangue, and many tragical words, setting forth the impossibility of this Change, and the absurditie of asserting it. To all this the Answer is plain and easie, and I hope will be convincing to such as do not look on things with the prejudice that this Gentleman seemeth to be under the power of.

42. I Answer then 1. This his Supposition we will never yield, nor we see more reason for it than yet hath been proposed: we deny that Authors he hath cited have made such concessions as he supposeth: if any of them have, let him answer the Absurdities that followeth on; we are not concerned, we can yeild no further than, the Apostles have settled the Government of the Churches in paritie among Presbyters and Nature having made a reses necessarie in their Meetings; sooner (the remains of the History of these Ages causeth that we cannot tell how soon) this Presidencie being constant in the same person, began to be taken more notice of than was fit, and more deference to be payed to the *Praesi* than was meet: and that after some Ages, some, in some places did Usurp, or grasp at more Power than was due: but that either the Solitude of Church Power, or the Superiority of it, was owned or practised avowedly, for the first three Centuries, we deny: yea, we do not find that it became Universal for some time after. Wherefore, the ground he buildeth his *Barterie* on failleth; and so, his roaring Cannon will prove but *brutа fulmina*; and we are not obliged to account for neither so sudden, nor so great a Change, as he mentioneth. 2. We can easily give a rational dilineation of such a Change, as was indeed made from the Apostolick constitution, and practice of the first times. We do not ascribe it to a *general Council*, nor to *a Conspiracie of all the Brethren in their scattered and Persecuted State*, to make that Change. Nor do we derogate from the *Holyness* and *faithfulness* of the first Pastors of the Church who were settled by the Apostles: let him please himself with all he saith to prove the Absurditie of thinking that a Change could be wrought that way. But 1. We are persuaded that a great Change there was, by compareing the Practice, and some Canons of *Cent.* 5, 6, &c. with the Apostolick Writings. 2. We think there is no impossibilitie in such a Change as I have acknowledged: considering the corruption of Men, yea the sinful infirmities of good Men; some of whom may be apt to Usurp; and others to overlook evils that are not easily observable in their Progress. And considering how sudden Changes to the worse have fallen out in the Church, see *Moses Precis.* *Deut.* 31. 27, 28, 29. see also *Exod.* 32. 8. and the frequent Apostacies of *Israel* after the death of their good Kings made this so evident, that it can never be denied, nor ought to be wondered at. 3. This Change did not come suddenly, nor all at once, and therefore was not so obvious to everie ones Observation: that it was not complained of by any

we cannot say; not having the compleat and distinct Records of the first Ages: farre less can it be affirmed that it was not observed by some who might Lament it in Secret; but for Peace sake, and because the things they had to Complain of were dark and doubtful, and but small and almost insensible Declensions from what had been before, they would make little noise with their dissatisfactions. It is well known that thus Degeneracie hath grown in latter Ages of the Church: and I wish it be not at this Day. Verie often a well Reformed Church doth thus degenerate, whose Maladie is like latent Diseases which are little observed till they be past Remedy.

§. 43. I adde 4. The true Account of this Change of the Church is given by way of Prædiction, by our Lord himself on the Parable of *the Tares of the field, Matth.* 13. 24. *&c.* this with other Corruptions grew while the Guids of the Church *slept*, which case, in some degree or other, is incident to the best of Men; and as, in process of time, the Ministers of the Church grew more remisse, this evil had the more advantage to grow. Of this I have Discoursed else-where; *Rational Def. of non conformitie.* I shall now attend my Antagonist, endeavouring to Run down this apprehension of things with many hard Words: which amount to no more but this, that *it was impossible to be brought about, because of the observablenes and suddenes of the Change, and the Faithfulnes of the Guids of the Church that then were set over her.* All which is already Answered. His ingeminating his Question about the possibility of this Change, P. 142. his saying, that *this cannot be imagined, if we believe the other parts of Evangelical History*; are but words that evanish into nothing, on supposition of the Account that I have given of it: for we deny that the Evangelical History, whether Sacred, or Humane, giveth us Account of such a constitution of Episcopacy as he imagineth, in the first Ages. That *no Historian took Notice of it, though it was most memorable*, p. 143. is still his rotten Hypothesis, that this Change should have been made suddenly, and all at once: and I adde the History of the time of the Rise and Progress of this is defective, and uncertain, as I have shewed, *sect.* 32. We do not say that *it was Agreed upon by some ambitious Ecclesiasticks*, as he P. 144. such Men might carrie it on in their several places, without Consultation; Nature, and a corrupt Heart, prompting them to it, and the World and Satan tempting them: yea, it might in some degree, be promoted by better Men than these, unawares; taking that for their Due which was not so: for its being *submit-*

ted to tamely (which he mentioneth *ibid.*) that was not to be wondered at, because of the Humility of some, and minding other work for the Peoples Edification, leaving the the Ruling part too much to those who inclined to it; and their not observing this Change, which by its insensible Degrees, made its Progress so in the dark.

§. 44 He *p.* 145, *&c.* draweth some absurd Consequences, by which he laboureth to load our Assertion, that the Apostolick Government of Paritie, was in after Ages, changed into Prelacie. The 1. is that *they who were marked for the Sacred Function by the Lord Christ, after some Experience, Judged it necessary to Change Parity for Prelacy.* 2. *That this Change was brought about, not in any of the ordinary Methods by which things of that nature are transacted among Mankind, but instantly, and in a miraculous manner.* 3. *That the immediate Successors of the Apostles were all Presbyterians* (this we hold) *but that these Presbyterians* (*most of them Martyrs for Christianitie*) *preferred Prelacy to Paritie.* 4. *That in their Opinion, there was no other Remedie against Schism and Confusion.* He saith, these Conclusions are evident, and necessarie, if their (the Presbyterians) Hypothesis be allowed. Such Consequences from our Opinion we utterly deny, and Challenge him to Prove their Dependance on it. The judicious Reader will easily see, that they all are Grounded on his fond Conceit, that we hold that this Change was made suddenly, openly, and all at once: if he find us Maintaing that, let him load our Opinion with as many absurd Consequences, as he can devise. And we neglect his triumphant Repetition of his continual Cant, *p.* 145, 146. about *the Universal Consent of the Christian Church, and its being received without Contradiction.* But to establish this last Notion, he telleth us, that none before *Aerius, opposed Episcopacy*; of whom, and his Actings, he taketh the liberty to give such Account as he thought fit for his design: that *his Motive was Ambition, and missing of a Bishoprick: was dull, had no Parts:* This (in this learned Authors opinion) must needs be the native Consequent of his being a Presbyterian: for he reckoneth them all such. I have given a more true account of *Aerius*, §. 16. *of* §. 6. Established on better Authority than he in this Narrative pretendeth to, which is none but his own. He needed not to spend a whole *page* to tell us what he meaneth by the *Impossibility* that he ascribeth to the Change we speak of, let him understand it as he will, we are not concerned, who have given account of that Change which maketh it both possible and easie to be understood. *p.* 148. He hath another Argument (if it be different from what he

he hath ſaid before) *we muſt not ſay, that the primitive Church immediately ſucceeding the Apoſtles ſo ſoon Apoſtatized from their Original Eſtabliſhment, elſe we have no certain Standard to know what is Genuine, and what is Suppoſitions in the whole frame of our Religion*: This he enforceth by telling us, *they might Change other things*; and *if the firſt and beſt Chriſtians were not to be truſted in matter of Fact, they are leſs to be truſted in matter of Opinion.* Here we have yet more plainly expreſſed, the *Popiſh* Principle, that the Churches Authority is the ground of our Faith: we do not ſo Truſt the firſt and beſt Churches (except the Apoſtles) as to make them the rule of our Religion, either in their Hiſtorical, or other Writings: We give that Deference to the Scripture alone. Again, we impute no ſuch Apoſtacie to the firſt and beſt Saints; but to them who, at ſome diſtance, Succeeded them; as hath been declared: and we know, that in after Ages, even among them who go under the name of the Fathers, other things were Changed, as well as Church Government.

§ 44. That our Reformers from *Popery* (whom he calleth the firſt Presbyterians, *p.* 149.) did not plead a *Jus Divinum*, is no Argument againſt us: for few of his Party, to this day, plead for a Divine Right to be on their ſide, as he and ſome few others do. And himſelf and his Complices, made no noiſe with it, when the *Oath of Supremacy*, and the *Teſt* were in Faſhion: our Reformers did not diſowne it, and they had not the Occaſion, and may be, not the Light, to aſſert it, that after-times had. Whereas it is palpable, that Intereſt maketh ſome of his Side to change their Note. If *Beza wrote ſmoothly to the Engliſh Epiſcopal Clergy, and ſome more freely to Mr. Knox, and Mr. Melvil*; I know no blame in that piece of Civility (unleſs he can ſay, that *Beza* ceded in many of his Principles, to pleaſe the *Engliſh Church*; which cannot be alledged. His imputing *Force and Violence* to us, and fancying that *no Records can be true or genuine that are againſt us*, we paſs, as angry and empty Words, but no Arguments: we owne all genuine Records that can be made appear to be ſuch; whether they be for us, or againſt us: but build not our Faith on any of them, except ſuch as are contained in the Scriptures of Truth. And here he bringeth in, *p.* 150. the Controverſie about *Ignatius's* Epiſtles; and imputeth to *Daily* and others, that *they reject them on no other ground, but becauſe they owne Epiſcopacy.* It is not fair dealing to impute ſuch Prevarication to a Perſon of *Monſieur Daillies* Worth, after he is laid in the Grave. He will not pretend, *p.* 156. to debate the matter about the Authority of theſe Epiſtles; but *p.* 150. and

150. and what follow, runneth out in a high Commendation of Doctor *Pearson*, on that Subject, and many confident Assertions, that what he hath said cannot be Answered. I shall be far from derogating from the Learning and Critical Skill of that Author. But am not convinced by his Arguments. I am sure there is not that Evidence, nor Certainty in them, that is sufficient for us to build on, in a Matter that Religion is so nearly concerned in, as is the Government appointed by Christ in his Church. He telleth us *Monsieur L' Arroque* attempted to Answer the Bishop of *Chester, but not to the Satisfaction of his own Party: and his Collections are Answered by Nourry.* The truth is, *L' Arroque* was prevailed upon by some of the Episcopal Party, (as witnesseth the Translator of *L' Arroques* Historie on the Eucharist, in his Life, *p.* 5.) by some specious Arguments, from the *Unseasonableness* of Debates among Protestants, to desist from that Work, and it never was perfected: therefore it might be the more easily answered: and we cannot judge what Esteem it would have obtained: it seems they dreaded the Strength of it. Whether *we ever were able to bring one plausible Argument for that Cause*; the Reader must judge; we will not in this, stand to his Decision, which he confidently maketh *p.* 141. he declineth (*ibid.*) *renewing the Debate about these Epistles*: wherefore I hope I may be excused if I do so too. And he asserteth that their Cause loseth nothing by their being laid aside: as I also affirm, that our Cause may be maintained, if they be allowed to be really what he would have them to be. Some Citations out of them I have answered *Cyprianick Bishop Examined.* And if he had thought fit to produce moe, it is like they might be found to do no hurt to our Cause. Or if he had cited what he talketh of out of *the Acts of the Martyrdom of Ignatius*, he might have received what should satisfie about it. A Distinction between Bishop (that is Moderator) and Presbyter, and Deacon, we owne, as well as these Acts do, which is all he mentioneth as making for him, in these Acts. He citeth *Wal. Messal. p.* 153. asserting, that *these Epistles were written in the beginning or middle of the second Century* (this is but the Guess of the Learned *Salmasius*) but our Author doth not tell us that *Salmasius*, in the same place, setteth forth, that they could not be written by *Ignatius*; from some Absurdities that he maketh appear to be contained in them. This Gentleman mistaketh, when he saith, *he that wrote them could not represent Ecclesiastical Policy different from what it was in the days of Ignatius*, that is to say, he could not mistake. He should have proved this, by demonstrating

demonstrating that that Person, tho he knoweth not who he was, had the Gift of Interrability: and if he ascribe that to a Person whose other Characters he knoweth not; he might as well say, that no Writer of that Age could misapprehend what was the Principle and Practice of the former. Is it not possible, that this Person might be another? *Diotrephes*; who, while there was some Tendency to a Declension from Parity, did zealously forward it; and run a little before the soberer and better Men of that time; and that his Zeal for the Opinion he had taken up might make him misapprehend, or misrepresent, what was the Opinion of the true *Ignatius*? it is a Dream, that *it followeth from the Concession*, or Guess, *of Salmasius, that that Author gave us a true Idea of the Ecclesiastical Policy of the beginning of the second Century*: and another, that *he must represent Church Policy as those in his own days thought it to be in the days of Ignatius*: there was nothing in all the Presbyterian Writings so *visionaire* (to use his own word) as this is. For could not this unknown Person differ in the Apprehension of this Matter, from most, yea, from all his Contemporaries? and it is strange that our Author should suppose that this personate *Ignatius* was a *Martyr*, or a Bishop; as he doth p. 154. He pleadeth next for the Epistles of *Ignatius*, from the Diligence and Authority of *Eusebius*; and saith, that *he hardly could be imposed upon in an Affair of this Consequence. A.* This is to beg the Question, to say that the Church was in this imposed upon: he should prove that the Churches then thought these Epistles to be written by *Ignatius*. for *Eusebius*, I think few, who are vers'd in Antiquity, will lay so much weight on his Historical Authority as this Author doth. Himself giveth ground to suspect some things that he wrote; as I shewed before: and others have observed yet more ground for it. It is a pleasant Argument, *the Church was careful to gather up some hard Bones of Ignatius, that the Lyons had left, Ergo, they were more watchful over the Remains of his Mind, viz. his Epistles.* If we have no more Certainty about the Epistles, than we have about the genuine Bones of that Holy Martyr, and other Popish Relicks; few wise Men will be much moved by Arguments brought from them. That *Polycarp* made a Collection of these Epistles, and *Irenæus* cited them, proveth no more but that good Men may be imposed on by Forged Writings. *Eusebius rejected some supposititious Books, after accurate Examination*; were a good Argument, if it could be made out that he rejected all such: the contrary whereof is well known. For his *Belief that the Orations of Cicero are genuine*, let him enjoy it; but if he build his Faith

Faith on any Article of Religion, or his Practice of Piety towards God on that Certainty, I cannot do so too. Whether *Cicero* wrote these Orations or not, is neither a Matter of such Moment, nor so contested by plausible Arguments, as what we now Debate is.

§ 45. What remains of my Antagonists Discourse on this Controversie about Episcopacy, is a Recapitulation of what he hath already said, in nine Questions: which he seemeth to set down as so many Trophies of Victory over all his Adversaries; and a few other Hints for strengthning his Cause. His Questions need litle Animadversion: all that is contained in them being already Answered, and his Opinion in these things disproved: whether concludently and solidly or not, the Reader will judge. His first three Questions do all suppose that we are against Prelacy, merely from *the Dichotomy of the Clergy* used in Scripture, which is a false Supposition: I have propoſed our Argument with more strength *Sect.* 4. §. 5. so as it is no way touched by what he here saith: wherefore it is no loss to our Cause if we give a negative, or affirmative Answer, to these Questions, whether he shall chuse. To his fourth Question *I* Answer, that Apostolick Power, as to its permanent Branches, was perpetual and successive (my Answer must be Tautological, because his Question is such) but not so, as to all its Essential Branches. As to its *necessary Branches*; if he mean what is necessary to the Beeing, or Idea of an Apostle, I deny these to be Perpetual and Successive. To the second part of this Question, *I* Answer negatively, that this Power was not transmitted, *in solidum*, to single Successors in particular Sees, but to a Colledge of Presbyters. Question fifth, *Where Superiority is forbidden*; is most impertinent to our Debate; seing he pleadeth for a *Jus Divinum* for it; he should bring either a Command for it; or what is equivalent. The *Popes* Monarchy over the Church is not more forbidden, than the Superiority of one Priest (as he speaketh) over another; both of them must be *Juris Divini*, in his Opinion. I retort his own Argument, if Parity be not plainly forbidden (which I am sure he cannot shew) then the Fancy of a *Jus Divinum in favours of Episcopacy (such as is exclusive of all other Forms of Ecclesiastical Government) is Groundless and Chymerical.* It is enough to us, that Christ hath instituted Parity, and he hath not allowed Men to change it: we think this a sufficient Prohibition of the Superiority that he pleadeth for. His sixth is a heap of Questions, to which *I* Answer, we deny the universal Tradition for Prelacy that he fancieth, and say, a more universal Tradition might be demanded. We deny also that the Argument

from universal Tradition (exclusive of Apostolick Tradition), if he can bring that he hath done his Work) is in this Case, either the most proper, or most necessary. Scripture Command, or Example, is both more proper, and more necessary. For the seventh, we do not pretend there was such a *great Change so suddenly*, as he fancieth we do; and therefore are not concerned to Debate the Possibility of it. *I* have said enough on this head, § 41. To his eighth, we affirm, that *Ferius* Opinion is fairly and truly represented by Presbyterians: and have answered what he saith to the contrary, *Sect.* 6. § 7. *& seq.* His last Question about *Ignatius's* Epistles may be retorted on himself, whether there be any solid Argument brought for them: *sub judice lis est.* Himself declineth that Debate, as *I* also do. *It* is enough to us, that even the Testimonies out of these Epistles are not concludent: and if the Epistles were Authentick, their Authority is but Humane and Fallible: and cannot be a Prejudice against Divine Institution: and indeed cannot make Faith where the Question is *de Jure Divino*, as here it is.

§ 46. *I* now proceed to consider some immethodical and incoherent Notions, with which he concludeth this Chapter. He telleth us, p. 260. *Prethyterians owne a Præsidency since the days of the Apostles* (he might have added, and in their days too) *so that the Quarrel is not so much against Episcopacy, as against the Extent of their Diocess, and Increase of their Power; over what it was in the Primitive times.* Now he will prove their Power over Presbyters to have been much more absolute, than now it is pretended to be: for *nothing was to be done without the Bishop; a Presbyter might not Baptize without his express Indulgence: as Tertull. witnesseth.* This Testimony of *Tertull. I* have answered, *Cyprianick Bishop Examined*, § 49. By Bishop may either be understood the Moderator, not in his single Capacity, but with the Presbytery: none might act within their District, but by their Allowance: or a Parish Minister, none might Baptize, &c. in his Parish, but by his Consent. He next citeth *Dyonisius* Bishop of *Corinth*, writing to the *Gnossians, exhorting Pinytus, their Bishop, not to lay the heavy burden of Cælibacy* (*I* suppose that he meaneth by Αγνεια) *on the Brethren, that is the Clergy*: whence he wisely inferreth the Power of *Pinytus* to have done this. And citeth on his Margin, *Euseb. hist. Eccles.* but neither Book nor Chapter, nor the place of *Dionysius* where the words may be found. *A. Euseb. hist. lib.* 4. *C.* 23. hath a part of an Epistle of *Dionysius* to *Pinytus*, and his Answer to him, where he checketh *Dionysius* for that Advice to him. But nothing of all this importeth the Power

of *Pinytus* to forbid Marriage: he might lay on this burden by preaching the neceſſity of *Celibacy*, without Authoritative impoſing it. Yea, he might impoſe it as *Præſes*, by the concurrent Authority of the Presbytery, without ſole Juriſdiction. He mentioneth likeways the *Canon. Apoſtol.* and *Ignatius's* Epiſtles, but citeth nothing out of them: ſo that he cannot expect an Anſwer. As to the Extent of Dioceſſes, we no further make an Argument from it, than we maintain that a Paſtor of a Church ſhould have no larger Charge, than he can diſpenſe the Word and Sacraments to; and that he ſhould not do this by Deputies under him. We lay no Streſs on the word Dioceſs, nor on the unequal Extent of a Paſtors Diſtrict, provided he pretend to no Power over his Brethren; nor have a Charge that he cannot manage without ſuch Superiority over others. What he ſaith of *Greg. Thaumaturgus* proveth nothing, unleſs he can evince that the Presbyters, who were neceſſary for the growing Charge, were his *U*nderlings, not his Collegues.

§ 47. A ſtrong Argument for Dioceſan Epiſcopacy (as he thinketh) he manageth, *p.* 164: *& ſeq:* from *James* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem; who was over many Congregations; for the Increaſe of Chriſtians was ſuch, as that they could not meet in one place.* The Anſwer hath been before given; *James* was no ordinary Biſhop, but an Apoſtle: and had Juriſdiction, not only over the Chriſtians in *Jeruſalem* and in *Judea*; but in all the World. He telleth us, that *we uſe many Evaſions; but he thinketh it then only ſeaſonable to Anſwer them, when he knoweth which of them we moſt truſt to.* If I had dealt ſo by his Book, no Anſwer had been given to it. I know neither which of his Arguments he moſt truſteth to; nor which of them doth beſt deſerve that regard. If he had anſwered all that we ſay, he could not have miſſed what we moſt truſt to: he ſhould deal with our Arguments and Exceptions, not according to our Eſteem of them; but according to the Influence they may have on the Debate now in hand. As for the Debate between *Clarkſon* and *Maurice*, we are not much concerned in it; it is not material whether there be more or fewer Congregations in a City, provided their Paſtors be not ſubject to one, but Co-ordinate among themſelves. His Information to him whom he calleth the *Vindicator of the Kirk*, was needleſs: he knoweth Attempts have been made to Anſwer *Blondel*, *Dally*, and *Salmaſius*, yet that Author might modeſtly put him in mind, how unfit it was for him to pick out here and there a word occaſionally ſpoken; and when he had (in his own Apprehenſion) baffled that, triumph over Presbytery, as if never

more had been said for it; while he hath neither out of his own Store, nor from the Answers of these Books, brought any thing against our main Arguments.

SECTION VIII.

Animadversions on the Book called the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery.

I Had resolved not to meddle with the ill Natured Author of *the Fundamental Charter of Presbytery*, further than I have done in answering his malicious Preface; *Appendix to Cyprianick Bishop Examined*; judging it more proper for some States Man, or one who is versed in the Law: his Book being a direct Refutation of an Act of Parliament, which he treateth very saucily: but finding, that they neglected his Book, and think it below them, unless they could also find his Person; and considering the affinity of what he treateth with what I have been now controverting with another (if not the same) Author, here speaking more dareingly, from behind the Curtain, on second thoughts, I judg'd it not amiss to take notice of what he sayeth, in some short animadversions (such as I have already made upon his Preface) in so far as he opposeth Presbyterian Government. I intend not to explain an Act of Parliament (I know the hazard of that from the experience of others) but I designe to shew how far the Presbyterians own what he opposeth: insisting only on what seemeth to be argumentative in his Book, and overlooking the Virulent Sallies of his Pen; which touch not this matter. He divideth his discourse into *eighth Enquiries*: I shall consider what he saith on each of them.

§ 2. His first *Enquiry* is, *Whether the Church of Scotland was Reformed solely by Persons Cloathed with the Character of Presbyters.* I observe two Mistakes (to give them no worse Names) in thus stating the Question. First, it is enough to us, if our Reformers were mostly, though not solely Presbyters: if a Bishop or two joyned in the Reformation, it doth not hinder that Persons of inferior Degree in the Church that then was, were the Men on whom lay the weight of this Work. Secondly, it is not so much material what Character our Reformers bare when they were yet *Papists*, as what Station they had in the Reformed Protestant Church in this Nation: or what Order they endeavoured to set up in this Church, when they had withdrawn from Subjection

to the *Roman Hierarchy*: for our Concernment is to know what were the Principles of our Reformers, being now Reformed, (for before their Conversion they were all Episcopal) and how they settled this Church with respect to her Government. But to gratifie my Adversary a little, I so far yield to the State of his Question, as to maintain, that few, if any, had an Active Hand in the Reformation, who had been *Popish Bishops*: but they moved in a lower Orbe in the *Popish Church*, who were helped of God to be Instrumental in that blessed Work. If he would have cleared the Question, he should have told us what he meaneth by Presbyters in the *Popish* Notion of that Word: For that Antichristian Society had left scarce either Name or Thing of the Order and Offices that Christ had appointed in his House, but confounded all, and builded a *Babel* of their own devising. To prove that our Reformation was not by Presbyters, he telleth us of *eight Prelates in the Reforming Parliament* 1560, *who all turned Protestants*: this is little to the purpose; for 1. The Reformation from Popery had made some Progress before that time, Preachers, and some private Men, did more for the turning Persons to the Truth, than Parliament Men did. 2. Eight in all *Scotland* was but a small Number: if there had been no more Hands at the Work, it had gone slowly on. 3. Among all these eight, there were but two Bishops, the rest were Prelates indeed, in the *Popish* Sense; Abbots, and such like; but I hope this Author will not say they were such as Protestants count Prelates; or that they have superior Power in the Church, to Presbyters. 2. *He* telleth us, that they who laboured most in the Reformation, were not in *Holy* Orders, and nameth some of them. *Ans.* Then I hope they were no Bishops. It is true, many of these worthy Men had no Ordination in the Popish way, nor were they Presbyters in that Church; but when they turned Protestants, they were made Presbyters, and not Bishops. Yea, *Claud. historic. def. of the Reformation, part 4. page* 15. saith, that *in many Nations* (among whom he nameth *Scotland*) *the Reformation was made by the Consent of the greatest part of their Pastors*: *to wit Monks, Preachers, Priests, Curats, Canons, &c.* And it is as certain as *History* can make it, that not a few of the inferior Clergy turned Protestants; whereas himself confesseth there were but two Bishops, *Argyle* and *Galloway*. Some of them, and these of good Note, and who were eminently blessed with Success, were but Lay-Men, (as he frazeth it) who by their private Labours converted many, and were at last Authorized to Labour in the Gospel more publickly,

ly, by such Ordination as then could be had; but they were never exalted to be Bishops. Let me digress a little, to observe that the *Laird of Dun* (by this Authors account) was after made a Superintendent; but never received into Holy Orders, by any thing that appeareth: whence *I* infer, that in the Opinion of that time, a Superintendent was not the same with a Bishop: which our Brethren use to plead for. *I* shall not insist on the further Proofs he bringeth of his Answer to the first Enquiry: they amount to no more, but that there were but few Ministers: and many Reformers were Lay Men: to all which *I* Answer; this sheweth that Presbyters, and Persons of an inferior Rank to Bishops, had a far greater Hand in the Reformation than Bishops had. It was far otherwise in *England*; where the State carried on the Reformation; whereas in *Scotland*, the greatest, both in State and Church, opposed it as long, and as much as they could: and even the two Bishops whom he mentioneth, did rather comply with the Reformation, than actively promote it: notwithstanding of all which, it is unbecoming a Protestant, to call our Reformation *violent, and disorderly*: as he doth, *p.* 7. out of *Spotswood*.

§ 3. The second *Enquiry* is, *Whether the Scots Reformers, what ever were their Characters, were of the present Presbyterian Principles? whither they were for the Divine Institution of Parity; and the Unlawfulness of Prelacy among the Pastors of the Church?* here he taketh a great deal of Liberty to Comment, and try his Critical Skill, on the Article of the Act of Parliament which he had undertaken to baffle. In which it is not my Province to interpose: *I* am little concerned in this whole Enquiry: if it be granted that Parity, and not Prelacy; was the Church Government that they chused. If this Debate have any Influence on the Controversie between us and our Brethren, it will make more against themselves than against us: for not only our Reformers were further from owning a Divine Right of Prelacy than of Parity; but they chused this, and rejected that: notwithstanding that they had been bred in the owning of it, under Popery. We think it was a great Testimony given by them to Parity, that they shewed so much Zeal for it, as they did, though they had not that Light about it, that after times afforded. It is certain, that that Dispute which had so long, by the Tyranny of the Bishops, been buried and forgotten, (except among the Church in the Wilderness, which few knew of, the *Waldenses*) could not at first be so fully understood, as by further Enquiries it came to be. Notwithstanding,

ſtanding, it is evident that our Reformers lookt on Parity as *Juris Divini*, though they did not much inſiſt on the Debate about that: for in *the Book of Policy, Chap.* 1. they have theſe words, *this Eccleſiaſtical Authority is granted by God the Father, through the Mediator Jeſus Chriſt, unto his Kirk gathered* (not to a ſingle Biſhop) *and hath ground in the Word of God, to be put in Execution by them, unto whom the Spiritual Government of the Kirk, by lawful Calling, is committed.* Here it is plain, that they are not for Indifferency of the form of Government: and *chap.* 2. There is this Article; *and to take away all occaſion of Tyranny, he* (that is God) *willeth that they ſhould rule with mutual conſent, as Brethren, with equality of Power, every one according to their Function.* And after, *there are four, ordinary Functions, or Offices, in the Kirk, the Office of the Paſtor, Miniſter, or Biſhop; the Doctor, the Presbyter or Elder, and the Deacon.* Where it is evident, that they own no Biſhop Superior to any ordinary Miniſter; but make the Identitie of them to be of Divine Right.

§. 4. I think it not worth the while to make a ſtrict Examination of the Proofs he bringeth, that our Reformers were not for a *jus divinum* of a Paritie, for if it were yielded, it doth not hurt our Cauſe. And his Arguments are verboſe, tedious, and inſignificant. I ſhall only point at them, and the Anſwers that may be made to them. There is, *p.* 9. *&c. no ſuch Controverſie was then Agitated in Europe; the Popes Supremacy was Debated, but not Prelacy;* Anſ. *nihil ſequitur*, our Reformers aſſert the Concluſion as I have ſhewed: but they and others were taken up in debateing greater Matters with the Papiſts: He doth falſly aſſert, *p.* 10. that *Churches, when they are Reformed, ſet up a Church Government ſuitable to the Model of the State, as in Geneva, which was a Common-wealth, they ſet up Paritie.* For who readeth *Calvin's* Writings may ſee, that they built on another Foundation; even Divine Inſtitution, and our own Countrey is an inſtance to the contrary: Paritie was in the Church, and Monarchy in the State. He calleth it *impudence* to cite *Calvine for this jus Divinum*: but if the Reader be at the pains to look into the Citations that this Author hath ſcraped together, to ſhew *Calvin* to be for Indifferency of the form of Church Government, he will ſoon ſee on whoſe ſide the *impudence* is. He confeſſeth that *Beza founded upon Scripture*: 131. but alledgeth that *he no where calleth Epiſcopacy abſolutely or ſimply unlawful.* If Chriſt hath inſtituted a Form, as it muſt be if one Form be built on Scripture; I ſee not what is further neceſſary to prove an oppoſite Form, inconſiſtent with that, to be abſolutely or ſimply unlawful. He telleth

reſteth us, *ibid.* that *Beza ſaith, that humanus Epiſcopatus is tollerable, if duly bounded, by the pure canons of the ancient Church*: and I ſay the ſame: for then it would be no more but a Preſidencie; which doth not deſtroy Paritie. He citeth alſo a number of ſeeming conceſſions out of *Calvine*: but they amount to no more than the lawfulneſs of a πρεσβεία in the Church; which is not our Debate. If *Beza was not for ſeparating from a church becauſe it was Epiſcopal*; no more are we: unleſs that Epiſcopal Church impoſe unlawful terms of Communion on us. His ſecond Proof is, *our Reformers had no peculiar Motives, or occaſion for adverting to the evil of Prelacy: nor intereſt to determine them to Paritie: nor were more ſharp ſighted to ſee the evil of Prelacie than other Reformers.* Anſ. a thouſand ſuch Arguments as this cannot conclude againſt a plain Matter of fact: I have ſhewed that they were for the Divine right of Paritie; wherefore it is in vain to tell us that they had no Motive to be of that Opinion. He falſly ſuppoſeth that other Reformers were not of the ſame Sentiments; ſeing moſt of them except *England*, ſet up the ſame Government. *Thirdly*, He argueth thus, *none of the Confeſſors, or Martyrs, or they who had moſt hand in bringing the Reformation to perfection, have given that as their Opinion.* And here hath a long Diſcourſe of ſome other Opinions that ſeveral of them vented, *they Declaimed loudly againſt the Biſhops of theſe times; but what is that to the Order, p.* 8. *they Declaimed againſt the Stavelings as well as againſt Biſhops; againſt Presbyters as well as Biſhops, p.* 19. And he hath a long Debate, with ſome of our Hiſtorians, about the Opinion of *John Knox* in this matter, which, meerly to ſave time, I ſhall not concern my ſelf in. Anſ. It being evident, that in our firſt Settlement of Diſcipline, our Church declared for the Divine right of Paritie, negative Arguments from the Writing, or ſayings, of private Men are inſignificant: and it is leſs to the purpoſe, to tell us of their other Opinions which have no relation at all to this Matter. He cannot ſo much as alledge that any of them have ſaid, or Written any thing to the contrarie, directly or indirectly. For his Debate about *John Knox*, I judge he hath ſaid nothing that can ſatisfie any imbyaſſed Reader, that theſe Hiſtorians had not ground to think that *Maſter Knox* lookt on Prelacy as a ſinful thing, and againſt Chriſts Inſtitution; That imparitie was Eſtabliſhed by the *firſt Book of Diſcipline*, is falſly ſuppoſed, *p.* 22. Superintendencie is no ſufficient Proof of it; of which afren.

§. 5. His next Proof beginneth *p.* 38. and is managed in a large Hiſtorical acount, of what influence *England* had on our Reformation from

from Popery: whence he inferreth, that *our Reformers proceeded on the same Principle with the Reformers of England.* Here he undertaketh two things; 1. To shew *what influence England had on our Reformation.* 2. *That our Reformers were generally of the same mind with the Church of England, in several momentous instances relating to Constitution and Communion, the Government and Policy of the Church.* For Anſ. to this Argument; it is wholly inconſequential, if he never ſo fully Prove all that he hath mentioned; except the laſt, about the Government and Policy of the Church: and even that ſignifieth nothing, unleſs he Prove that by the influence of *England* our Reformers were for Prelacy; and not for Paritie; and that as Inſtituted by Chriſt. Wherefore I paſs over the laborious proofs he brings of the other things, and ſhall conſider his laſt Article; and what he ſaith for what he hath aſſerted about it. The Reader, without my Animadverſion, will take notice of his unmanly depreſſing of his Native Countrey, and fawning on another Nation. This aſſertion that we oppoſe is not proved by our Reformers *Communicating with the Church of England* (which he inſiſteth on from *p.* 7.) it only proveth that they thought Epiſcopacy did not unchurch a Society that was otherwiſe ſound in the Faith. And if ſome three or four of them did *ſerve in the Church of* England *under Biſhops* (for which we have no more but *Arch-Biſhop Spotſwoods* word) this might either be by the Indulgence of the Reforming Biſhops, not requiring of them theſe Terms of Communion that the late Biſhops did of theſe who got Places under them: or it ſignifieth no more but that one or two Men of a Partie were of more Latitude in their Principles than the reſt were. For what is ſaid of *ſome of them approving the Engliſh Liturgy*, is leſs to his Queſtion, which is only about Government. We never thought that our Reformers, at firſt, were all of the ſame Principle with us in all things; I am ſure they were far from being of all the Sentiments of the preſent Epiſcopal Church. Yea themſelves had afterward, other thoughts of ſome things, than they had at firſt: as *Luther* held many Popiſh Opinions at firſt, which afterward he rejected. I obſerve further, that in many of his Hiſtorical paſſages about ſome of theſe Reformers, his beſt ground for what he affirmeth is, *it is not to be imagined*, that they did ſo and ſo: or *it is to be preſumed.* We muſt then believe the Truth of Matter of Fact on his fancy, that ſo it muſt be. If I thought it worth the while, I would Examine theſe Hiſtories more narrowly. But I could eaſily yield him all, without prejudice to our Cauſe: ſeing the Principles of our Reformers are better known

known by their publick Deeds, than by the private Sayings, or Practices of two or three of them; and these not sufficiently attested. These good Men did much rejoyce in the Reformation of the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, as also in her casting off the load of humane Ceremonies, by which she had been burdened; but that all, or most of them, were satisfied with their Government and Discipline, is the Question; and is not Proved by what he hath said. It is least of all Concludent, that *these of the Church of England had good Opinion of the Church of Scotland*: which he laboureth to Prove, *p.* 80. and it is unaccountable, that *p.* 81. he layeth on so much stress on our Reformers saying of *England*, that *they were of the same Religon with us*: which he puteth *in majusculis*: we say the same of them at this day: and I hope they think not otherwise of us: and yet we think Paritie to be *juris divini*. If he can find a Contradiction here, let him try his Skill to discover it. It is an odd method that he useth, *p.* 85. he will prove that *the Scots Reformers were for Episcopacy, because it was natural for the English, who had assisted in the Reformation to demand it*. And I Prove they were not for it, because, *de facto*, they did not settle it, but a way inconsistent with it. Let the Reader judge whether of these two Arguments is most concludent. We do not find that the *English* made such a Demand, and if they did not, they acted like discreet Neighbours, not to impose on their Brethren, who had other sentiments of the Matter, and who agreed with them in the main points of Religion. And if they made such a Demand, the Event shewed that it was not listned to. For his Citation of *Buchannan*, *p.* 88. that *Scoti ante aliquot annos Anglorum auxiliis è servitute Gallica liberati, Religionis cultui & ritibus cum Anglis communibus subscripserunt*: himself confesseth that no other Historian hath mentioned it; and he hath taken care that we shall not be able to Examine *Buchannans* words, by mentioning *Buch.* 7. 14. in a Book of so many diverse Editions: who can hope to find the place? I know not what *Buchanan* could mean by it; but it is evident, if the *Scots* did so subscribe, they did not act accordinglie; which was no Sign of their Inclinations that way: It is nauseous to repeat, with him, so often, *the Godly Conjunction, the Unity, Peace, and Christian Concord, that was then made between England and Scotland*; and to set forth this as a Demonstration: Yea, a Set of Demonstrations, that *the Scots Reformers were Episcopal*: nothing can be more ridiculous than to talk at this rate, in the Face of Matter of Fact, that they settled Parity as soon as they could settle any Order in the Church.

§ 6. He undertaketh, *p.* 96. and forward, to prove, that *at the Reformation, the English Lyturgy was used in this Church.* If this should be granted, it cannot prove that the *English* Church Government was used also: they wanted qualified Ministers, so that there was need of some help to them, in Praying and Instructing the People publikly; and it may be, there was no other that they could, at that time, use, and they had not so fully discovered what might be, and afterward was, excepted against in it; and therefore used it for a time: but I think he will not deny, that as soon as they could, they laid it aside; and made use of that more Unexceptionable Form of *Geneve*; till at last, that was disused also, as a Man layeth by his Crutches, when he getteth Strength to go by himself. He sheweth wonderful Skill in Logick. *p.* 98. *Calderwood* had said that the *English* Lyturgy, which was read in the new Colledge in *Saint Andrews, was not of any continued Practice in time by past since the Reformation*; *Ergo*, it was practised at the Reformation. Whatever may be said of the Consequent, the Consequence is no better than this, I never used to smoak Tobacco in any continued Practice since I was born, *Ergo*, I did it when I was born, *p.* 101, *&c.* he telleth us of another Principle, wherein our Reformers agreed with them of *England*: that *the Church had a great Dependence on the State: that it belonged to the Civil State to reform the Church: that the People might appeal from the Church to the Civil Magistrat, &c.* this is still, *extra oleas vagari.* I shall not so far digress from the purpose in hand, as to consider what the present Presbyterians hold as to these Assertions: nor need I compare the Opinion of our Reformers with ours in this matter: if he can charge us with Hetrodoxy on this head, we shall Answer him when he will. This whole Discourse is impertinent: it doth not prove that our Reformers were for Episcopacie: and if it did, it is no good Consequent; that we should be for it too. I have alreadie said, that we never thought our Reformers were, in all things, of the same Opinion with the present Presbyterians: and I am sure, that he hath far less cause to think that they were for all that the present Prelatists hold. Another thing more he sheweth; that *the Scots and English Reformers agreed in this, p.* 105. that *they took for the Rule of Reformation, the Word of God, interpreted by the Monuments and Writings of the Primitive Church.* And here he enlargeth in the Commendation of this Rule, and obliquely chargeth the Presbyterians with all *the Horrid Rebellions, and Uncertain Divisions, unaccountable Revolutions, both in Church and State, which have*

have Unhinged all the Principles of Natural Justice and Honesty, and Disabled, nay eaten out, the Principles of Christianity among us; that now we are not so much disposed for any thing, as for Atheism. Which Strain I find is common with Men of his Stamp: but it is most disingenuous Dealing: for the World knoweth where the Fault of our Divisions doth ly: and whether Atheism, Immoralitie, and Injustice have thriven more under the Influence of Prelacie, or of Presbyterie. For the *Resolution* that he seemeth to be so angry with, the Presbyterians think it their Glorie to have Countenanced it: and the Bodie of the Prelatists (in *England* I mean, not in *Scotland*) will not disowne their Accession to it; nor will they look on it (as this Author and some others do) to have *Unhinged the Principles of Natural Justice and Honesty.* The Rule of Reformation that he had mentioned, he saith *he will bring in again by and by*, where we shall attend him.

§ 7. He telleth us, *p.* 106, *&c.* of his Performances, which he recapitulateth; and concludeth, in the highest Measure of Confidence that Words can express, that *our Reformers were not for the Divine Right of Parity.* I am so dull that I cannot see this Point proved, for all that he hath said: and if it were proved, it is nothing to our main Cause; we never said that they were in all things, either as Presbyterians, or as Prelatists are now, in their Opinions; all that we assert is, that they were for Paritie, and practised it as the Government of the reformed Church of *Scotland*, and it is more than probable, that they were for its *Divine Right.* In what followeth, his Confidence ariseth yet higher, and that in the Entrance of what now he is attempting, and about which he maketh very large Promises, *p.* 108. where he pretendeth *to give plain, positive, direct, and formal proofs of his Assertion, to as high a degree, as the nature of the thing is capable of, or can reasonably bear.* For performance of this; his first Attempt is, *in a Petition of the Reformers to the Government; this is one Article, as it is set down by Lesly, de rebus gestis, Scotor. lib.* 10. *p.* 504. *Ut Episcopi deinceps & Pastores, illi Dominorum ac Nobilium cujuscunque Diœcesis, bi parochorum assentione, ac voluntate ad beneficia coöptentur.* There is nothing Answerable to the Evidence so confidently promised by him: it is no *positive, plain, &c.* Proof: the matter could bear more, *viz.* if *Lesly* had said, that however, the Schismaticks, (as he calleth them) were for abolishing the old Doctrine, that they were for keeping up the ancient Hierarchie. But that this is no sufficient Proof of his Conclusion; I shew, 1. Supposing *Lesly's* Veracitie, and

fair Representation of the Addreſs that the Reformers made, no more can be concluded from it, but that it is ſuppoſed, that the Revenues of Biſhops could not quickly be alienated, and that ſome muſt be choſen to enjoy them, that they might be ſo and ſo choſen: here is not a Word of chuſing Biſhops to Exerciſe that Office over, or among the Proteſtants: and it is well known, that the Rents of Biſhops, Abbots, Priors, and other Dignitaries of the Church of *Rome*, did continue; and Men were choſen to the Name, and Rent, of theſe Places, who did not Exerciſe the Power that Men under theſe Names had in Popery. 2. Himſelf confeſſeth, that this Article of the Petition is otherwiſe rendred in *Buchannan*, and *Spotſwood*; *viz.* *Ut Miniſtrorum electio juxta antiquam Eccleſiæ conſuetudinem penes populum eſſet.* Here is no Word of Biſhops: and one may think, that we have more Cauſe to Credit theſe two Proteſtant Hiſtorians than *Leſly*, a Papiſt; who, on all Occaſions, ſheweth his Spite againſt Proteſtants: eſpecially *Spotſwood*, an Arch-Biſhop, would not have neglected to make uſe of this ſeeming Countenance to his Cauſe. This Author hath no other Shift to take off the Edge of this Exception, but to tell us, that *Buchannan minded Matters of State moſt in Hiſtory: and Spotſwood is very defective in many parts of his Hiſtory*: which is indeed to ſay, that neither of them is to be much regarded: but *Leſly* is the Man: if it be ſo, we muſt look on the whole of our Reformation, with a very unfavourable Eye. Whither this will ſeem abſurd to this Author, or not, I know not. He is at a great deal of Pains to prove, that *Leſly did not Forge this Article*; and bringeth no fewer than ſix Arguments to prove it: which I judge not worth my Labour of Examining them: only this Reply I return to them all: what if he Miſworded the Article, though he did not Forge it? the other Hiſtorians have the ſame Article, only they have not the Word Biſhops, in which lyeth the whole force of our Authors Argument.

§ 8. His next Argument, which beareth *poſitive*, *plain*, &c. *Evidence*, is from another Petition of our Reformers, ſet down in the Hiſtory commonly aſcribed to *John Knox*, *p.* 131. a large Portion of which he Tranſcribeth; I ſhall Compendize it, without taking any thing from its Strength on his Side: they require that *the ill Lives of Prelates, and the State Eccleſiaſtical, may be Reformed*; *and Declare that they envy not their Honours, nor covet their Poſſeſſions*; *but deſire their Reformation*: and they add, that *we are content, that not only the Rules and Precepts of the New Teſtament, but alſo the Writings of the Ancient Fathers, and the Godly and Appro-*

ved

and Laws of Justinian the Emperor, decide the Controversie betwixt us and them: and they *earnestly desire, that notwithstanding the long Custom they had to live at their Lust, they may be compelled either to desist from Ecclesiastical Administration, or discharge their Duties as becometh true Ministers.* Let us now hear what Improvement he maketh of this Passage to his purpose: he telleth us, that *here our Reformers lay down a Complex Rule for Reforming of the Church*: and we refuse not to try it with our Opposites, in the Controversie about Prelacy, by this *Complex Rule*: but with these two Limitations, which cannot be made appear to be inconsistent with what is there expressed by our Reformers: one is, that all the Parts of this Complex Rule, be not lookt on as of Co-ordinat Authority; but that the rest be subordinate to the Holy Scripture: we are not afraid of the Verdict of the Fathers of the first Ages; but if they should be found in any thing to recede from Scripture, we reject them. The other is, that the Laws of *Justinian*, which our Reformers mention, be rather lookt on as a Rule concerning the Temporalities of Church Men, than their Spiritual Jurisdiction. He next saith, that *our Reformers were content that the Clergy should live and rule, and discharge their Trust, as they did in the days of Justinian*: *and now*, saith he, *if they who so Petitioned, were for Parity, and not for the Continuance of Prelacy, I must confess my Ignorance to be very gross.* *Ans.* I shall not determine whither Ignorance, or somewhat else hath led him into a gross Mistake of the Meaning and Design of these Petitioners: but a Mistake seemeth to be evident. They were not so absurd, as to make the *Roman* Civil Law the Rule of Religion: we know how that hath been altered, and reformed oftner than once; whereas the Rule of Religion is unalterable by the Authority of Men; wherefore they can mean no more, but that they are willing that Prelates should enjoy their Benefices, (this for Peace sake they yielded too) as they were setled by the good Laws of *Justinian*: (where a Limitation even in that is insinuated) and that the Lives and Authority of the Pastors of the Church, should be regulated by Scripture and the Writings of the Fathers in Subordination to that. *Justinian* lived in the sixth Century, when Prelacie was far advanced in the Church: wherefore they had Acted very absurdly, if they had been for that way, and yet so quickly settled among themselves (contrarie to the Inclinations of their Friends in *England*, to whose Assistance they owed very much) a way so opposit to that. Our Reformers, the Nobilitie, Gentrie and Ministers, were neither so unfaithful, nor so changeable, as to

be

be influenced by one or two Men to such an absurd Course. I add all this, that it is most absurd to say, that the Church of *England* to the Writings of the ancient Fathers for the Rule of the Reformation or for any part of it: for indeed, by that Rule, there will be found Canonical Nullitie in the Power of all their Bishops; on account of their being chosen by the Magistrat, and sitting in Parliament: for *Can. Apost.* (confirmed by *Concil. Constantinop.* 6. *Canon* 29. revived by *Concil Nicen.* 2. *Canon.* 3.) condemneth the one, and *Can.* 6. and 80. the other.

§ 9. After mentioning another Petition of the Reformers, which containeth no new matter, he cometh from *p.* 119. to prove, that *the first Church Government that our Reformers settled, was not Paritie, but Superintendency*: All that he saith on this head, hath been often answered, and it hath been made plain, to the Conviction of them who will see, that *Superintendency*, as set up in *Scotland*, was nothing like *Episcopacy*, that it was never intended to be continued; but used for the present Necessitie: and that it was never lookt on as inconsistent with their being for Paritie in Opinion: but we must submit to the Drudgerie of Repetition; seing he will have it so. I take notice of his forgetting what he had said a little before (as I observed §. 2.) *viz.* that the *Laird* of [illegible] was made a *Superintendent*, though it doth appear that he was never in Holie Orders: whence it evidently followeth, that on this Authors supposition, the Reformers lookt not on *Superintendency* as a Government any otherwise warrantable, but by the Force of Necessitie. Two things he undertaketh about *Superintendency*. 1. To shew *their Power and Disparity from other Ministers*. 2. To *dissipate the Mists cast in this matter by Presbyterians*. For the former, he telleth us of *a considerable Stock of Prerogatives, or Preheminencies above other Church Men*. As 1. *They had larger Districts*. 2. *They were to be Nominated by the Council, and Elected by the Nobility and Gentry, &c. within their District*. 3. *They were not to be Censured, but by the Ministers and Elders of the whole Province, over which they were Appointed*. 4. *They were to be Admitted* (which our Author calleth Ordination) *by other Superintendents*. 5. *They were to be Translated by the whole Church*. 6. *They must be two years, at least, in the Ministry, before they be Superintendents*. 7. *He had a greater Benefice than other Ministers*. 8. *Every one of them was a constant Member of the General Assembly*. 9. *He was to try Candidats for the Ministry, and Readers*. 10. *He had the Power of Collation, on Presentations*. 11. *He had Power to plant Ministers in the Churches where the People were negligent*. 12. *He had the*

Power

Power of Ordination. 13. *Ministers were subject to him, in all lawful Admissions; he was to be obeyed.* 14. *He had Power of Visitation of Churches.* 15. *He might depose Ministers.* 16. *He might translate Ministers.* 17. *He might nominat Ministers to be Members of the General Assembly.* 18. *He had Power to hold Diocesan Synods.* 19. *To appoint Fasts within his own Bounds.* 20. *To modifie Stipends.* 21. *To receive Appeals.* 22. *He had Power of Rusing, in case of undue Appeals.* 23. *To determine intricate Cases of Conscience, or Government.* 24. *To judge of Divorces.* 25. *To enjoyn Pennance to greater Criminals.* 26. *To restore Criminals.* 27. *He had the Power of Excommunication.* 28. *To delate attrocious Criminals to the Civil Magistrat* 29. *They had great Power over Schools and Colledges.* 30. *They were the Licensers of Books.*

§ 10. *Quæ non prosunt singula, juncta juvant*; here is a large Muster Roll, to Fright the Reader with a numerous and long Train, that might have been, to as much advantage, drawn into a narrower Compass. I shall first, Make some general Observes on all this Heap of *Prerogatives*. Next, Examine them particularlie, but very succinctlie. For the former, I observe, 1. That the Power of *Superintendents* was at first more absolute, and independent on the rest of the Ministers, than afterward; becausse at first there were hardlie any qualified Ministers, but only Readers, or such as could Catechise the People, newly come out of *Popery*; but when there was a better Stock of qualified Ministers, and yet the Church but meanlie provided, the *Superintendent* was obliged to rule with their Concurrence; and was little other than a constant Moderator: and his Power was by every General Assembly, abridged, till that Office was at last abolished, as no longer needful in the Church. 2. It is not denyed, but that there was an Imparitie between a *Superintendent* and another Minister: but this was lookt on by our Reformers, not as a standing Office, nor as having any Foundation, but that of present Necessitie: so that it did no way derogate from that Paritie, that they lookt on as the Way that the Church should be Governed; and as what they intended, when their Case should allow it. But of this more afterward. 3. All this cannot make the *Superintendent* and the Bishop, to be the same Officer in the Church; becausse the one is pretended to be an Officer appointed by Christ, and his Soveraign Power over the Presbyters, is by Divine Appointment: the other is set up by Men, and more or less Power is given to him, as they think fit. The one is accountable to none but Christ, the other is accountable to the Presbyterie, and may be Censured, yea Deprived by them. The

one

one is lookt on as what should always continue in the Church; the other was designed but for that Exigency of the Church, to be laid aside when that was over. 4. Not a few of these *Prerogatives* are either asserted, without Ground; or Misrepresented. To make out which, I proceed to the second thing I proposed; *viz.* To Examine them particularlie: for the first, *The Extent of their District* is no Argument for such Disparitie as he pleadeth for: they had each of them, their proper Charge, as other Ministers; where they were ordinarilie to Labour; but had larger Districts for Visitation. 2. Their *Nomination by the Council, and Election by the Nobility and Gentry*, is asserted without Ground. Neither doth he Cite any Authoritie for it, nor do I find any thing to that purpose in any of our Historians. 3. *A Superintendent could not be deposed, but by the Ministers of the whole Province*: This necessarilie followed upon his Charge, or Power of Visiting, being of that Extent. In that he was deposeable by the Ministers, it is evident he was no Bishop, in the Notion that our Brethren have of a Bishop. 4. The same reason was for his *being Elected by the Ministers of the Province*. What our Author saith of the *Ordination* of the *Superintendent*, is a foull Misrepresentation; as any one may see in the place he citeth, *Spotf. hist. lib. 3. p.* 159, 160. Nothing is there mentioned, but Election and Trial; but on the contrarie, it is expresse said, *other Ceremonies than this Examination, the Approbation of Ministers and Superintendents, with the publick Consent of Elders and People, we do not admit.* Whence it is evident, that he had no new Office, nor Ordination, above a Presbyter.

§ 11. His fifth Prerogative is, *He was not to be Translated from one place to another, but by a Council of the whole Church.* This is no Episcopal Jurisdiction. The Extent of his District, to a Province made this necessarie: there being no Judicature above his Province, but a *General Assembly.* 6. It is least of all Argumentative, that *he was to give good proof of his Qualifications, by being some time in the Ministry*: becaus the want of due Qualifications in the Generalitie of the Ministry, was the Rise of his Office: therefore he must be the best qualified that can be had. 7. His *greater Benefice* is no Argument: he had more Work, and Occasion for Expense, by Travelling to Visit Churches, than the rest had. It is falslie alledged, that *Spotf. p.* 210. saith, *it was agreed*, 1567. *that the Superintendent should succeed to the Benefices of the Popish Bishops deprived*: there is not such a word in that place: only there, and in the former page, it is agreed, that *the Church should be restored to her Patri-*

mony.

monie. 8. There *being constant Members of the General Assembly*, saith no more, but that there being so few qualified Ministers, these few choice Men were needed in the Assemblies of the Church. 9. His *trying Ministers and Readers*, was from the present necessities of the Church, when Presbyteries could not be had to do it. 10. His *giving Collation* did follow on the former Power. 11. The *jus devolutum* for planting a Minister fell to him, and his Council. He could not place a Minister by himself, as our Bishops pretended to do: but by the assistance of such Ministers as were fittest to judge, these were his Council; this also was for the present necessity, and want of Ministers to make a Presbytery. 12. His *power of Ordination*, our Author passeth very slightly, and with a general alleging of several Acts of Assemblies. It is like a *Superintendent* might Ordain by himself, when no other Minister could be had to joyn with him: but as soon as Presbyters could be had, it was not so. Our Reformers used no other Ceremonie in Ordination, but Nomination, and Tryal, and Approbation; and it is evident that these were to be performed by the *Superintendent*, with the rest of the Ministers; for *Spotsw.* p. 155. sheweth out of *the Book of Discipline*, that this Tryal and Approbation was to be performed *by the learned Ministers appointed for their Examination*, then not by one Man alone. 13. Subjection to him (which our Author is pleased to call *Canonical Obedience*, was a necessarie consequent of his Office; but it is to be observed, that in the Assemblie 1562, out of which he allegeth this Passage, *Superintendents* were Tryed and Censured by the Assemblie: and it was appointed that at every Assemblie, they, and Ministers, and Elders should be Tryed, as to their Conversation; which looketh not like Episcopacy. 14. His *power of Visitation* was indeed his main Characteristick; but doth not prove Episcopal *jurisdiction*; it being delegated to him by the Church, and he being Accountable to her for it. 15. His *power of Deposing* is expresly said to be given him by the Assemblie, and he is ordered to report his Diligence to the next Assemblie; which last, our Author overlooketh. 16. His *Translating of Ministers* is no more, but that his Consent, or that of the whole Church must be had to a Transportation: it was then necessarie when there was no Presbyteries to Judge of such Matters. 17. He greatly mistaketh when he saith that *the Assemblie Enacteth that Ministers for the General Assemblie should be brought with the Superintendents, &c.* which he will have to be Nominating them, and he alloweth the rest of the Synod but a Consent: whereas *Spotsw.* p. 219. words it, *such as the Superin-*

tendents shall choose in their Diocesan Synods. If he could choose them by himself, there needed no Synod for this end: that Expression can signifie no less than the Synods suffrage in the Election. *My Lord Glam.* Letter that he mentioneth is not Authentick. 18. He *held Diocesan Synods*, because he was their Moderator. 19. They might *appoint Fasts in their bounds*, but with Advice of the Ministers. 20. *Modifying of Stipends* is no Spiritual Power, and therefore, impertinently here brought in. 21. *Appeals* was made to him, and his Synodal Convention: here is no sole Jurisdiction. 22. His *power of Fineing* is no Spiritual Power. 23. *Determining Cases of Conscience, and their Questions*, was never committed to him alone; but in the Synod, and to them. Yea, Question so determined were to be reported to the General Assemblie next ensewing; so that *Manuscript* that he so often Citeth, *p.* 14. 24. *To judge of Divorces* is a civil Power: and not to our purpose; 25. It is clear, by his own Relation, that the *Injunction of Pennance* (as he calleth it) is to be by the *Superintendent* with the Synod. 26. *Restoring of Criminals*, or *Absolution*, did the same way belong to him. 27. *Notifying Criminals to the Magistrat* is no part of Jurisdiction. 28. *Excommunication* was not to be done by his sole Authority; but by his Advice. 29. His *Power over Colleges.* And 30. His *Licensing of Books*; both of them Depend on the Civil Power: and are not to our present purpose. These short Notes may shew how little cause there is for his Triumph, with which he concludeth this his Enumeration of the *Superintendents Prerogatives.* They prove a Disparity between him and other Ministers, I confess; which the Church in that her State thought necessarie for a time: but on the other hand, it is evident that some of them Prove as much Disparitie from, and inconsistencie with the *Prerogatives* of a Diocesan Bishop, which our Brethren plead for, as belonging to him, *Jure Divino.*

§. 12. His next Work from *p.* 140. is to *dissipat the Mist wherewith the Paritie Men are so very earnest to darken the* Prelatical *Power of the Superintendents*: he mentioneth Three of their Exceptions. The 1. Is, *it was not intended to be a perpetual standing Office; but was Temporary, and for the then Necessities of the Church.* For this he Citeth *Calderwood*, and *Petrie* asserting this; with whom I do cordially joyn. Against this, he thus reasoneth. *p.* 142. *whether it was Temporary or not, it was Prelacy, and this is all that I am concerned for*; And to Fortifie this, he taketh in by force, a Similitude from *the Presbyterians making Address to King James*; a rare, but useless piece of Wit. Ans. If he be concerned for no more than this,

we

we are agreed: And he yieldeth that our Reformers were not Episcopal, but Presbyterian: who in a case of extream Necessity, gave, for a time, more Power to one Minister, than another, but made them all equal assoon as that Necessity was over: It is such an Argument as if there were but one Congregation, with their Minister, and Elders, in an Island; they manage Church Discipline by themselves; but assoon as they encrease, and there are moe People and church Officers, and more Congregations, they set up a Presbyterie, to which all the Congregations and their Pastors are Subordinate; will any say that they are *Independents*, because they were forced to Act *Independentlie* at first? there is as little reason to conclude that our Reformers were Episcopal, though they were forced to use a kind of Prelacie for a time. Beside that I have above shewed some considerable Differences between the Prelacie of *Superintendents*, and that of Bishops, which our Brethren plead for.

§. 13. His second Undertaking is, to shew that *we have no sufficient Ground in the Records of these times, for pretending that the Office of Superintendents was designed to be Temporal.* To prove his Assertion, he saith, *he hath seen no more insisted on to make out this, but a Phrase in the first Head of the Book of Discipline, at this time.* He transcribeth the whole Passage out of *Petrie, Cent. 16. p. 218.* and so must I, *what was their* (the Superintendents) *Office*, saith he, *appears by the first Book of Discipline, wherein it is written thus, we consider, that if the Ministers whom God hath endued with his singular Graces among us, should be appointed to several places, there to make continual Residence, that then the greatest part of the Realm should be destitute of all Doctrine; which should be not only the occasion of great Murmure, but also dangerous to the Salvation of many: and therefore we have thought it a thing expedient*, at this time; *that from the whole Number of Godly and learned Men, now presently in this Realm, be selected ten or twelve.* (*for in so many Provinces we have divided the whole*) *to whom Charge and Commandment should be given to Plant and Erect Kirks, to set, Order, and appoint Ministers* (*as the former Prescribed*, to wit, the former Head) *to the Countries that shall be appointed to their Care, where none are now.* Afterward it is added, *these must not be suffered to live as their idle Bishops have done, neither must they remain where they gladly would; but they must be Preachers themselves, and such as may not make long Residence in one place, till the Kirks be Planted and provided of Ministers*, &c. To this our Author replyeth, by giving us a Sense of his own of these Words in the *first Book of Discipline, viz.* that *because there were then so few Qualified for the Office of*

Superintendencie, the Ten or Twelve were, by far too few for the whole Kingdom, yet at that time they thought it expedient to Eſtabliſh no more: and though, when the Church ſhould be ſufficiently Provided with Miniſters, it will be highly reaſonable that the Superintendents ſhould have Places appointed them for their continual Reſidence, yet in that Juncture it was neceſſary that they ſhould be conſtantly travelling into their Diſtricts, to Preach and Plant Churches. Before I Examine what he ſaith to Prove this to be the true Gloſs of that Paſſage, I ſhall Prove it to be contrarie to, and inconſiſtent with the Paſſage it ſelf. And 1. There is nothing in that Diſcourſe that doth ſo much as inſinuate the ſcarcitie of Men fit to be *Superintendents*, but of Miniſters fit to Preach to the People; they no way hint that this Settlement was fallen upon, becauſe they could not get Men to Overſee other Miniſters, but becauſe they could not get Men to Preach to the People in every Congregation, Therefore, they reſolve that the few well Qualified Men that they had ſhould not only each of them, have a fixed Charge of his own, but ſhould be obliged to Preach in other Pariſhes, and be Impowered to Place Miniſters in them, aſſoon as they could be had. 2. It is a groundleſs Fancy that they thought Ten or Twelve *Superintendents* too few for the whole Kingdom; for when Miniſters increaſed they made no moe: yea, when afterward, in the times of Defection from our firſt Eſtabliſhment of Church Order, they ſet up Biſhops, the Church did not think Twelve too few for the whole Kingdom. 3. He doth exceedingly Miſtake the Change that our Reformers did intend, as inſinuated in that Paſſage: It was not that *Superintendents* ſhould be continually Reſident in one Place, whereas they were at preſent to travel within their Diſtrict: for in this preſent Settlement they had their proper Charge, where they were to Preach, and might Reſide there three or four Months, and enter upon their itinerat Viſitation again: which Courſe, if they ſhould Break off, they could not do the Work of a *Superintendent*; which was chiefly to Viſite and Plant Churches. When this was done, and Places generally provided with fit Paſtors, their Work and Office was at an end. 4. *At this time*, doth evidently relate to the Peoples want of Preaching, as the Motive to this Appointment; and to the Planting of Churches, as the End and Deſign of it. Wherefore, when this End is attained, and *that time* no more Exiſtent (I mean of that Exigence of the Church) there was no more uſe for them: and the Event Proved, that as that End was by Degrees attained, their Power was gradually Leſſened, till they were wholly laid aſide.

aside. 5. The Words cited make it evident that this was not intended for a lasting Prelacy in the Church; far less for an Episcopacy standing on a *Jus Divinum*; For the Assembly where this *Book of Discipline* was Established, do give them *Charge and Commandment*: they do appoint their Work, set Limits and Bounds to their Power: they Command them in the very Circumstances of their Work; this would be thought strange Presumption in a Meeting of Ministers thus to treat their Bishop. 6. To say that their Authority was designed to be perpetual, but these Injunctions about some part of their Work was to be Temporary; is to speak at Random; and to put what Sense we please on other Mens words; it is to tell us what this Author would have the Reformers to mean, not what is the plain Import of their Words: For the *Commandment and Charge* (these are the Words of *the Book of Discipline*) by which they were made *Superintendents*, did include one part of what is Injoyned as well as another part of it: and when ever this Work that was Injoyned them ceased, their Commission behoved to be renewed: as is obvious to any who readeth the History of our Reformation; their Injunctions were often Changed, till they had no more Work to do, and then they were Abolished.

§ 14. Let us now hear how this Author will Prove that the Passage under Debate must have the Meaning that he hath put upon it. His first *Argument*: *the Composers of the first Book of Discipline* (in which that Passage is) *were generally to their Dying day, of Prelatical Principles.* Ans. 1. The Consequence is naught: for however the first Draught of it might be framed by the Six Persons whom he Nameth, out of *Knox*, *p.* 287. yet let the Reader turn over to the next *page*, where a *Formula* is set down according to which it was Subscribed, and he shall find that they Approved it conform to the Notes and Additions thereto: and it was well known, that some Papers being Amended and Licked over and over again, by many Persons, (as this was) have at last Differed much from what the first Compilers intended. Another thing also may be Observed in that Form of assenting to *the Book of Discipline*: that they were careful to Reserve *to Bishops, Abbots, and Priors, and other Prelats, and benefic'd Men, which else have Adjoyned themselves to us* (say they) *to brook the Revenues of their Benefices during their Lifetimes; they sustaining and upholding the Ministry and Ministers, as is therein specified, for Preaching of the Word, and Ministering of the Sacraments.* Here the Bishops (even such of them as were Protestants) are put in the same Categorie with Abbots

and

and Priors; and there is no Provision made for their Spiritual Power, but for their Temporal Goods; and no Successors are intended for them: only they are provided for while they live: yea the Administrators of Word and Sacraments are here contra-distinguished from the Bishops, as well as from Abbots and Priors. Doth any thing here look like Prelatical Principles? yea is not the whole Strain of this Passage contrarie to them? therefore, whatever the first Compilers of the Book of Discipline might be, it is evident, the Approvers of it were not of the Episcopal Principles. *Ans.* 2. He sheltereth his Assertion under the Ambiguitie of Prelatical Principles: if he mean these Men were for *Superintendents*, who had a Temporarie Limited Prelacie, we shall not Debate that with him: if he mean that they were for a *Jus Divinum* of the Prelacie, that he and his Partie owne; or for a Perpetuitie of any other sort of Prelacie, we shall consider his Proofs for that; which are, *Winram and Willock were Superintendents, and so was Spotswood; of whom his Son saith, he was a constant Enemy to Paritie*: this proveth nothing against what I have said; except he can assure us that Arch-Bishop *Spotswood* could not, through Prejudice, and Respect to the Cause he had Espoused; mistake and misrepresent his Fathers Opinion in that. *Dowglas* (another of them) was Arch-Bishop of *Saint Andrews*. That proveth him an Apostate from the Way he had owned; and we know how he, and his Way was disliked by the rest of his former Associats: *John Row*, another of them, *defended the Lawfulness of Episcopacy, at a Conference appointed by the General Assembly*, 1575. Here is a pitiful Shift, and foul Misrepresentation. The Truth of the Storie is (even according to *Spotswood*, as well as *Petrie*; not to name *Calderwood*, lest he alledge that I have read no other Historian) a Question arising in the Assemblie about the Lawfulness of Episcopacie: six Brethren were appointed to Debate the Question in a Conference, three were appointed to be on the one side, and three on the other; it was *Master Rows* Lot to be on the side of the Lawfulness of Episcopacie: can any Rational Man thence infer, that he was of that Opinion. And if he were of that Opinion, there is enough said to take off any Inference that could thence be made against us. *John Knox* was the other of these Compilers, whom he will make Prelatical; now when he hath been dead a long time; though he was known to be far from such Sentiments while he lived.

§ 15. For a second Proof of his Sense of the Passage cited out of *the Book of Discipline, p.* 145. *Knox assignes a quite other Reason than the then Necessities of the Church, for the Establishment of Superintendency. Superintendents*

dents and Overseers (saith he) *were nominated, that all things in the Church might be carried on with order and well: this reason is perpetual.* *Ans.* How weak is this Consequence: for *this reason is perpetual*, that there should be Governours in the Church; because *all things might be carried with order and well*: but it is no reason for that sort of Governours; except in so far as the present case made them necessarie; so that, compare this Passage with that of *the Book of Discipline* above cited, the Sense must be, *Superintendents* were, *at this time*, nominated, that *all things in the Church might be carried with good order and well*; there being then no possibilitie to constitute Presbyteries, by which things could be so managed. He citeth another Passage out of the same Book, *p.* 289. that *John Knox, in a Sermon, asserted the Necessitie* (*and not the bare Expediencie*) *of Superintendents.* *Ans.* Doth this prove a perpetual Necessitie of that Office? it was then not only expedient but necessarie? and this was all that was asserted. Again *John Knox's* words are, *there was a Necessitie of Superintendents or Overseers*: that is, there must be a Government in the Church, and another they could not then attain that they could be satisfied with; and therefore they must set [illegible] *Superintendents.* If we duly consider this Passage, it maketh much against him: for supposing the Necessitie of Governours, they might have thus reasoned, if they had been for Bishops, we must have Governours, nothing hindreth to set up Bishops; therefore they are necessarie *at this time*; but this they did not do: therefore they were not for Bishops. But they well reasoned; there must be Governours; but at this time we cannot have Ministers to set up Presbyteries, therefore at this time *Superintendents* are necessarie. He bringeth another Testimonie out of *Knox*, *p.* 110. (it must be miscited, nothing to that purpose is in that place) *exhorting England that every one of their Bishopricks might be made ten*: *which* he saith *is a Comment on the Passage in Debate*: and saith, *hence it is clear, that he was for many Bishopricks.* *Ans.* Nothing but Prejudice could suggest such a Sense of his Words: he is Writing to a People which had settled Bishops among themselves; he did not attempt to alter their Settlement (he knew it was in vain) but he advised them to what might make that way most useful, and what might have brought it as near as possible to the way he was for. I could tell him of just such another Passage in *Doctor Wild's loyal Nonconformist*, though he was for no bishop at all, in our Modern Sense.

§ 16. He bringeth a third reason, that *this Sense of the Period accordeth exactly with the whole Tenor of the first Book of Discipline*: *where*, he saith,

ſaith, *there is nothing more for the Temporaryneſs of Superintendency, but much to the contrary.* Let us ſee then what we can further find (beſide the words *at this time*) in *the Book of Diſcipline*, for *Superintendents* being ſet up early, for the preſent Neceſſitie of the Church. And firſt, the reaſon for ſetting them up, which the Book it ſelf giveth, is temporarie: to wit, the Paucitie of Miniſters, and the Neceſſitie of having the Goſpel preached in all the parts of the Nation. If the Foundation be temporarie, ſo muſt the Superſtructure: but this is made the Foundation of that Erection: as is expreſſed in theſe words, *and therefore we have thought it expedient, &c.* 2. *The ſecond Book of Diſcipline* is a Proof of this beyond Contradiction: for it owneth no Officers in the Church but Paſtors, Biſhops or Miniſters, every one of which was to be fixed in a particular Congregation: and Doctors, and Elders, and Deacons: and theſe are ſaid to be *ſuch as ought to continue in the Kirk, as neceſſary, for the Policy and Government of it; and no more Offices ought to be received or ſuffered in the Kirk of God, eſtabliſhed according to his Word: therefore all the ambitious Titles invented in the Kingdom of Antichriſt, and his Uſurped Hierarchy, which are not of theſe four ſorts, together with [illegible]ffices depending thereon, in one word, ought to be rejected.* This *ſecond Book of Diſcipline* was but an Amendment of the firſt, and a Suteing of it to the riper Age that the Reformed Church of *Scotland* had then attained: but, it is manifeſt, that ſettling *Superindents* by the firſt Book, was not deſigned for Perpetuitie. I ſhall now Examine what he bringeth againſt the deſigned Temporarineſs of *Superintendents*: the firſt thing alledged is, *the neceſſity is brought for being not ſo ſtrict in examining Superintendents as afterward muſt be*: I ſee not wherein this is contrarie to the Presbyterian Gloſs (which he affirmeth p. 145.) ſeing the neceſſitie of ſetting them up had been before aſſerted, *viz.* the Paucitie of qualified Miniſters for the Pariſhes: and now another neceſſitie is alledged for taking ſuch *Superintendents* as they could get: where is the Inconſiſtencie of theſe two. Next, they appoint, that if ſufficient Men *cannot be had, Provinces wait till they can be provided, rather than ſet up inſufficient Men.* 3. *Rules are laid down for ſupplying the Vacancy, if a Superintendent die.* *Anſ.* To both theſe; no more followeth but that *Superintendency* was to endure for ſome time: foreſeeing that the preſent neceſſitie was like, in ſome degree, to continue for ſome years: but this is no Argument for its Perpetuitie, or neceſſitie in all Caſes of the Church. 4. *After the Church is ſettled, and three years paſt; Directions are given for chuſing Superintendents.* *Anſ.* This Paſſage is related

ted only by *Spotswood*; whom I might reject as an insufficient Witness, as well as he casteth *Petrie*, or *Calderwood*, when *Spotswood* doth not concur with them: But I need not such Defence: by *the establishing of the Church* the Reformers cannot mean the compleat Establishment, and being furnished with a sufficient number of well Gifted Ministers: for what needed three years delay after that, before they would require such Choise of *Superintendents*: wherefore, by the settling of the Church must be understood the peaceable Exercise of Church Government, as well as other Ordinances, allowed them by the Magistrat, which then they were contending for: or the peaceable Settlement of the *Superintendency*; that now they were Erecting: that though at present, they must put into that Office such as they could find, they would after that three years, be more exact in their Choise, hoping that, by that time, more qualified Men might be found: this proveth a Design of Continuance for some time; but not of Perpetuitie of *Superintendency*. 5. *The Book of Discipline supposeth Colledges and Superintendents to be of equal Continuance: for the Superintendent was to have a hand in Election of Principles and Rectors, and in Auditing Colledge Accompts. Ans.* If this Argument had any Force, it would prove that Apostles, immediatlie sent by Christ, must continue as long as Churches and Ministers; because they were imployed to Erect the one, and Ordain the other: Yea, he needed no other Argument to prove their Continuance, but that they were to Visit Churches, and plant Ministers; and therefore must continue as long as that were to be done: and so they should for ever shut out, (in the Design of our Reformers) not only Presbyteries, but the Diocesan Bishops: they were to do that Work in the present Exigence: it doth not thence follow that they must continue as long as that Work was to be done.

§ 17. He hath yet a fourth Argument, to prove that *Superintendents* were designed by our Reformers to be perpetual in the Church. It is taken from some Passages in *Knox*, and the *old Scots Liturgy*, about the Form and Order of the Election of *Superintendents*. 1. The *Necessity of them* is asserted: which I have answered before: Next, *The People are asked if they will obey and honour him as Christs Minister so long as he is faithful: not* (saith our Author) *so long as the present Exigence requireth. The admitting of a Superintendent and of a Minister was one: the whole Form maketh the one to be of Divine Institution, as well as the other: he is said to be called of God, and owned as a Minister of Christ, they who will not submit to him, are*

said to rebel against God, and his Holy Ordinance. In the Prayer after his Installment is this Petition, Send unto this our Brother, whom in thy Name we have Charged with the chief Care of thy Church within the Bounds of Lothian, &c. Thus (saith our Author) *our Reformers lookt on Superintendency when they composed this Form.* *Anſ.* 1. This is not a Form compoſed by the Reformers to be uſed on all ſuch occaſions: as appeareth by the Hiſtory it ſelf that he citeth: to which he (*Knox p.* 289.) prefixeth this Inſcription; *The Form and Order of the Election of the Superintendent and all other Miniſters; at Edinburgh, March the* 9. 1560. *John Knox being the Preacher.* alſo becauſe, in the Prayer, *Lothian* is mentioned, which could not be in a general Form: This Method *John Knox* at that time uſed. It is like it was uſual to proceed in this Method: to uſe theſe, or the like Queſtions, to Pray to that Purpoſe: and if there was then a preſcribed Form in that Infancie of the Church, it neither helpeth his Cauſe much nor hurteth ours. 2. He acknowledgeth that the Form of Electing and Admitting Miniſters and *Superintendents* was the ſame: and it is evident from the Inſcription but now mentioned, which is an Evidence that *Superintendency* was not then lookt on as a diſtinct Office from the Miniſtry: but it was an Application, or Modification, of the Miniſterial Work which at that time was neceſſary. He will not ſay, that a Biſhop needeth no other Ordination or Conſecration, beſide that which maketh him a Miniſter: which is a good Argument to prove that our Reformers did not look on the Diſtinction of Miniſter and *Superintendent* as perpetual and of Divine Right, as the Prelatiſts do that of Biſhop and Presbyter. 3. My main Anſwer is, the account that we have in the place cited is of the Election and Admiſſion of a Perſon to the Sacred Office of the Miniſtry, whither he be to be a *Superintendent* or not: and that it is not by this Admiſſion that he is diſtinguiſhed from other Miniſters further than that his Miniſterial Charge is made larger and more extenſive as to its Bounds: wherefore all the Expreſſions that my Adverſary layeth hold on in this Form of Election, may fairly be underſtood with reſpect to the Perſons Miniſtery: to this Miniſtery *he is called of God*: with reſpect to it he is *a Miniſter of Chriſt*, it is that which is called *God's Holy Ordinance*: it is that Charge which is *laid on him in God's Name*: and indeed it was the Bounds of *Lothian* that the Perſon then admitted got the Chief Charge of, to be their Paſtor. Now the Queſtion is not whither this Paſtoral Charge, whither in one or more Congregations be Gods perpetual Ordinance; but whither it be ſuch an Ordinance that

that the Paſtoral Charge of one Perſon ſhould extend to ſo many Congregations, and whither this Paſtor by himſelf ſhould have Power to plant Miniſters: we ſay this laſt was a prudent Conſtitution of the Church, which that preſent Exigence did force them upon: by this Admiſſion then he was made a Miniſter according to Chriſts Inſtitution, and a *Superintendent* too, ſo far as that Office includeth the Miniſtry: but wherein it differed from the Miniſterial Office, it was of Man and not of God.

§ 18. He hath yet a fifth Argument, *p.* 150. which according to his wont, of uſing the higheſt Confidence, and biggeſt Words, when the Strength of his Reaſons are loweſt, he calleth *Irrefragable*. It is drawn from *ſeveral Acts of General Aſſemblies*: ſome of which *addreſs to the Council for Maintainance to them*: others *for Increaſing their Number*, and *Placing them where none were before*: *and that when the Church was of four years ſtanding; and when the Number of Qualified Men were ſomewhat Increaſed.* One Petitioned, that *all the Popiſh Clergy ſhould be diſpoſſeſſed, and that Superintendents, Miniſters, and other needful Members, ſhould be Planted in their Places.* Whence he very wiſely inferreth, that *Superintendents were needful Members of the Church, and that they were to ſucceed to the Popiſh Biſhops.* This is mentioned by *Spotſwood*; but by none elſe, as himſelf obſerveth. *Some Superintendents in the year* 1574. *would have Dimitted, but the General Aſſembly ordered them to continue in their Function.* I am ſo dull as not to ſee the Strength of this *Irrefragable* Argument; I can ſee no Conſequence that can be drawn from any thing, or all that he hath ſaid, but that the Churches found the neceſſity, which occaſioned the ſetting up of *Superintendents*, not to be over in four years; nor wholly in fourteen years: though Qualified Men Increaſed, yet their Number was very unproportionate to the Neceſſities of the Church. I look on the Increaſing of their Number (which muſt be a Leſſening of their Diſtricts) not as tending to perpetuate them; but on the contrary, it was a reducing them by Degrees, to the State of other Miniſters; by reſtricting them to a fewer Number of Pariſhes, and ſo at laſt to one. That they were *needful Members of the Church*, at that time, I doubt not; but this doth not prove their deſigned Perpetuity: that they were to *ſucceed the Popiſh Biſhops*, is a wild Fancy; that is no more ſaid of them than of other Church Officers, who were to be Planted in the Places where theſe Biſhops had been, and were to be Maintained by their Revenues. He concludeth this head, as is uſual with him; with Confident Rehearſing

what he hath made evident. The Judicious will judge of his Performance; and mine too. I agree with him in what followeth, p. 153, 154. That *the Superintendents, when Churches were provided, were no more to travel among them*; but I affirm, when they were sufficiently provided, their Work was Confined to one Parish; and that Office ceased in the Church: of which before.

§ 19. He advanceth now, p. 154. to another piece of his Work; to consider our Reasons for the Temporariness of *Superintendency*. The first of them, that he nameth is, the *Force of Necessity*, there being so few Men qualified for the Ministry, scarcely one in a Province: against this he bringeth several Replies, intermixed with an unbecoming Confidence, and bitter Reflections. The first is, *this Reason is inconsequential, because that necessity might have been answered by dividing the Nation in as many Parishes as there were qualified Men, and Lessening them as moe qualified Men could be had. Ans.* The course that was taken, was materially the same that he proposeth: only it was necessary, that within these great Parishes, the Minister, or *Superintendent* of it, (call him as you will) should have Power over the Readers and ill qualified Ministers who were set in the several little Parishes, and who could neither dispense the Word sufficiently, nor govern the Church; and should have Power to plant qualified Men, as soon as they could be found in these lesser Parishes: and this was the Office of a *Superintendent*. I hope the Reader will see, that this Reply to our Reason is insignificant, and that our Reason is not shewed to be inconsequential. His second is, *this Reason destroyeth Parity: for that could not be the Model that our Lord instituted, which cannot answer the ends of its Institution; as in this case Parity could not do: for here the Church is reduced to that State that the Governours thereof forced by necessity, must lay it aside for a time, and establish a* Prelacy. *Ans.* This is stranger Divinity than what he chargeth in his next Reply on our Reason. It supposeth, if it have any Sense in it, that all Gods Institutions and Injunctions, do so serve for all the cases that can fall out, that no necessity can excuse a temporal receding from the Observance of them. Which to be evidently false, shall be made appear in Answer to his third Reply (which upon the matter is the same with this) the Model of Government that himself, and other Prelatists, is for, is lyable to the same Inconvenience; and according to his Logick, is *none of Christs Institution*. He, and the rest of them, maintain, that by the Laws of the new Testament, there can be no Ordination of a Presbyter without a Bishop,

and

and yet they think themſelves warranted by Neceſſity to allow Ordination without a Biſhop: *Downam*, in his Sermon about Epiſcopacy, hath this Paſſage, *poſitâ enim Eccleſia, aut in univerſum Epiſcopo deſtituta, aut conferta Hereticis aut Idolatricis Prælatis, quales Papiſtici ſunt, a quibus nulli Orthodoxi Miniſtri ordinationem ſperare debent, dubitandum non eſt quin priſci Patres, in tali neceſſitatis caſu ordinationem ſine Epiſcopo factâ permiſerint, licet non ut regularem, ordinarii Eccleſiæ regiminis regulis reſpondentem, efficacem tamen, & quæ juſtificari poſſit, ubi deeſt Epiſcopus.* (I have not his Sermon by me in Engliſh, and therefore uſe the Latine Tranſlation) And he citeth *Concil. Antiocb. C.* 10. for it, and pleadeth for it by ſeveral Reaſons. Here that Learned Perſon, had in great Eſteem in the Epiſcopal Church, maketh two Caſes of Neceſſity, in which the Model he pleadeth for as Chriſts Inſtitution, muſt be receded from. And if Prelatiſts may allow Presbyters to Ordain in Caſe of Neceſſity, why may not Presbyterians allow a ſingle Perſon to Ordain under the ſame Force and Cogency? Alſo *Forbes. Iren. p.* 158. *& ſeq.* not only aſſerteth, but proveth the Force of Neceſſity to warrant ſuch things: withal aſſerting the *Jus Divinum* of Epiſcopacy: and he inſiſteth at length to prove this Propoſition, from Scripture and Antiquity; that Presbyters may Govern and Ordain in want of a Biſhop.

§. 20. His *Third* Rply is, *it is ſtrange Divinity, that Paritie is of Chriſts Inſtitution, and yet may be laid aſide in caſe of neceſſity*: and here he falleth heavily on, *G R.* for aſſerting what this may be inferred from: and taketh occaſion to reproach him. I find no more ſhew of reaſon in this part of his Diſcourſe (though there be many bitter and harſh words in it) but this, that *if we may do ſo in one thing, we may do ſo in all things.* Anſ. I ſhall ſhew that this is no *ſtrange Divinity*, and then Anſwer his Reaſon againſt it. It is not rare Divinity; for I have already ſhewed that *Downham* and *Forbes* (Men of the firſt Rank among his own Partie) teach the ſame. That it is is not againſt Scripture nor Reaſon (and therefore not ſtrange) I Prove, 1. It is taught by Chriſt himſelf: it was Gods Command that the Sabbath ſhould be ſtrictly obſerved, the Law containeth no expreſs exeption from this Rule: yet our Saviour maketh the caſe of Neceſſity to be a juſt Exception; in that he Defended his Diſciples *plucking the Ears of Corn on the Sabbath day*; and that by other Examples, where Neceſſity had the ſame influence: *Luke* 6. 1, *&c. David* appoved by Chriſt, in the place cited, thought it no *ſtrange* Doctrine: it was the Inſtitution of God that none ſhould eat the *Shew Bread* but the

Prieſts

Priests: *David* and his Men were no Priests, and yet their Necessity did warrant their eating of it. The Apostles thought it no *strange* Doctrine; who (though they knew that the Jewish Ceremonies were abolished, and become unlawful to be used after the Resurrection of Christ; and though *Paul* told the *Galatians* when the case of Necessity was now over, that *Christ should profit them nothing if they were Circumcised*; yet they enjoyned the Observation of some of these Ceremonies, and pleaded Necessity for it, *Acts* 15. 28. and 29, verses. *Paul* Circumcised *Timothy*, Acts 16. 3. used the Ceremonies proper for the Jewish votaries, *Acts* 21. 23, 24. enjoyned forbearance to them who observed the Jewish Ceremonies, *Rom.* 14. 1. though out of that case of Necessity, he severely condemneth that Observation. *Gal.* 4. 9, 10, 11. 2. Reason, as well as Scripture, doth plead for this influence of Necessity, on humane Actions. For 1. Necessity (I mean such as the Providence of GOD without our sin, bringeth us into) is a Declaration of GOD'S will; now this cannot be contrarie to that Declaration of his will that is made in his Word; when the Word and Necessity seem to clash (for they can never be truely inconsistent, being both from GOD) and if in that case we should sin by yielding to Necessity, we should be under a Necessity of sinning; which no Divine will say a man can be under, without his own fault. To take the present case for an Example: let us suppose Church Government by Paritie is Christs Institution; suppose also that there are so few Ministers that there cannot be Men got to supplie Places, but such as are palpably insufficient for the Work: here is a *Dilemma*, either Gospel Ordinances must be neglected, or unduely managed, by these Men; or on the other hand, they who are Qualified must be set over these for a time, to Preach now and then in their Places; to Direct and injoyn them what is right, to Plant the Places with Qualified Men when they can be got: all which is supposed to be crois to the letter (I do not say to the Meaning and Design) of the Institution; in the first Case, the Church should sin in neglecting that which is the main Design of all Gospel Institutions, *viz.* Edification, and Saving of Souls; therefore, she doth not sin on the other hand, by crossing the Letter of the Institution: otherwise she should be under a Necessity of sining, without her own fault bringing her under that Necessity. 2. Although our LORD did forsee all the Cases and Circumstances, in which his Church was to be unto the end of the World, and could have fully Provided for them all, by giving distinct Laws suted to every one of them; yet infinite

Wisdom

Wisdom thought fit to give Laws for regulating the ordinary cases of the Church, leaving these that are rare, and Extraordinary to be Managed according to the general Rules of Scripture, and sound reason, because distinct Laws for all possible Cases, would have swelled the BIBLE to a bigness which would have made it less useful to us; and of this it may be said, as of a Case not unlike to it, *John* 20. 30, 31. *The World could not have contained*, at least Men could not have Read, and Retained, the Contents of all *the Books that should have been Written*; no doubt, when GOD made the Law forbidding that the *Shew Bread* should be eaten by any but by the Priests, he forsaw what case *David* and his Men would be in: but he thought it not fit to provide for that Case by an Express Exception from the Law; but left it to be Ordered by his more general Laws: Even so it is in the Case that we Dispute about.

§. 21. I shall now Answer his Reason brought against this yielding to Necessitie, in cases of Divine Institution which is, that *if Necessitie can oblige Christians to forsake, or to cross Institution in one Case, why not in all Cases.* The Consequence that this his Question implyeth, we simply Deny. And I may Confidently say, that himself, in his cooler thoughts, will be ashamed of it at least he will have few Men of Sense, whether Learned or unlearned, that will allow such a Consequence. Farless, that will Joyn wit him in what followeth, *viz.* that *crossing Institution when forced to it by the Law of Necessity, what is it else than to open a door to Gnosticism, to Infidelity, to Apostasie; and to all imaginable kinds of Antichristian Perfidie, and Villanie?* To clear this Matter, and to still this Noise, and that the Reader may understand this Debate about the Force of *Necessitie* better than this learned Author seemeth to do: I shall shew when Necessitie may warrant an Action, which without such Necessitie were unwarrantable, and when not. 1. It is not feigned or pretended Necessitie that can have this Force: we are far from thinking that it is a sufficient Excuse when on hath done an evil thing, to say there was Necessitie for it, I could not shun it; if our Reformers did but pretend Necessitie for setting up *Superintendents*, or if we do but pretend it for them; if my Antagonist can prove (as he hath alleged) that there was no Necessitie for it, but that if they had been for Paritie; they might have Promoted the Gospel without thus diverting from it, *for a time*; we shall quit this Argument; GOD is Judge in that case, whether the Necessitie be real, or only pretended; And in many cases, Man may Judge, and Punish them who break the Law, and pretend Necessitie for

for their Action. 2. It must be a Necessitie of GOD'S making, not of our own bringing on; as I hinted before; If either a Church, or a Person, do sinfully bring themselves under a Necessitie of Transgressing the Law; the sinful Cause maketh the Action sinful which is consequential to it. 3. The Necessitie that we shelter our Actions under must not only be of the Means, nor only of the End, but of both. I suppose a Man cannot save his Life, his Libertie, or Estate, but by doing what is sinful, or omitting what is a Moral and perpetual duty, or is such *hic et nunc*. Here is the Necessitie of Means, but it cannot excuse him because there is no Necessitie of the End, it is not necessarie that we should Live, be at Libertie, nor that we have Estates; there is neither an absolute Necessitie of these nor comparative Necessitie: none of them is so necessarie as it is to keep a good Conscience, and to please GOD; and shun sin. Again suppose the End be necessarie V. Gr. to advance the Interest of Religion; but this End may be attained to by means that do no way cross any of GOD'S Institutions; to do what is cross to Institution, in that case is no way Excusable: For there is no necessitie of the Mean. If my Antagonist can shew that either the End of setting up *Superintendents*, was needless; or that that could be attained without encroaching a little on Paritie, *for a time*; then shall we no more plead Necessitie for what they did; but judge that they were not for Paritie in their Principles. 4. We distinguish, with respect to the Force of Necessitie, between these Actions which are Moral from their Nature, and these that are Moral only by Institution. How far Necessitie may Warrant, or not Warrant an Action against the Moral-Law, I shall not now Dispute; our present Debate, not being concerned in that Question: it is evident that there are some cases in which Necessitie, even in such Actions, hath place, as *Adam*'s Sons Marrieing their Sisters; of which *Lyra* and *Menochius* in *Gen.* 4. 17. say, *Initio mundi necesse fuit Sorores Fratribus nubere*. And it is also certain that no Necessitie can dispense with some other Actions that are naturally Moral; such as Blasphemy, Lying, *&c.* but in Matters of Institution, the LORD hath not so strictly bound his People, nor made his Institutions to clash with the natural and indispensible Commands that he hath laid on them: as is evident, in *David's* case above-mentioned: If Institution, in some Circumstances that the LORD hath cast his People in, do clash with the Moral Dutie of saving Life: this Moral Dutie superceedeth the Obligation of Institution, in that time, and in that case, much more when present Circumstances make

Insti-

Institution to clash with the great End of Institution; as in the case in hand: without dispensing with Paritie in this case, the End of Church Government had been lost; *viz.* the Edification of the Church, and Promoting the Reformation. If any should object, that this is a dispensing with the Law of GOD: I Answer, it is not Mans dispensing with GOD'S Law; but his Judging that GOD, in that Case, dispenseth with his own Law; or as *Aquinas* 2. 2. *Q.* 88. *Art.* 10. *Fit ut hoc quod erat lex non sit lex, in hoc casu*, and 1. 2. *Q.* 96. *Art.* 6. *Qui in casu Necessitatis agit præter verba Legis, non judicat de ipsa Lege, sed judicat de casu singulari in quo videt verba legis observanda non esse.* And indeed, to denie all Influence of true, real, and innocent Necessitie, to change the Moralitie of some Actions, especially these that relate to Instituted Worship, were to put Mens Consciences on such a Rack, as there were some times, no possibilitie to attain to well grounded Peace. And on the other hand, I hope what is said will Defend this Opinion from the horrid consequence that he is pleased to draw from it: especially when we consider, that this influence of Necessitie must be but for a time; not perpetual: because it is not to be thought, that any of GODS Appointments are so contrived, as to be always unpracticable: or that the LORD will bring his Church, or any Person, under such a lasting Necessitie, that they never can do what he hath Commanded, they using their utmost endeavours to observe all that he hath Commanded, as is injoyned *Matthew* 28. 20. I shall not Determine what Necessitie of Omission one may be perpetually under; but I understand not how this can be with respect to positive Acts contrarie to Institution.

§. 22. He dealeth with a Second Plea that he imputeth to us, *p.* 157, *&c.* why our Reformers are not to be thought Episcopal in their Principles, notwithstanding of their setting up *Superintendents*, which is; that these *Superintendents* did very much differ from Bishops, in the Notion that our Adversaries have of Bishops: The Author of the *Ten Questions* calleth that a *New Modell of Episcopacy.* To take off this *Calderwood* bringeth some Differences between them and Bishops: and *Vindicat: in Answer to the Ten Questions*, mentioneth also some of them, and Addeth what after he confesseth to be Material. All which he is pleased to *ridicule*, with his wonted Insolencie: but I am confident the judicious Reader will easily discern who is most Ridiculous; he that Proveth a *Superintendent* not to be the same with a Bishop, from his Election, Examination, and Admission: that he had no new Consecration, as Bishops

must have, and so was in no Superior degree to a Presbyter: that there were no *Arch-Superintendents* as there were Arch-Bishops, &c. or he who compareth these to *the ordinary Habit of the one, with the State and Grandeur of the other in their distinguishing Marks*: which yet, if not set down in such scurrile terms, as he useth, may make a great Difference between the Temper of the one sort of Men and that of the other; though not of their Office or Power. If our Reformers had intended to continue that sole Jurisdiction of Prelats in the Church, which they found settled in it under Poperie, this Change that they made, even in these things, is unaccountable: nor can a Reason be given why they kept not to the old District that the Bishops had before Governed. It is as evident, as any thing can be made at such a distance of time, that the *Superintendents* never had that absolute Power in the Church that our Episcopal Brethren now allow to their Prelats. Though we denie not that they had a Prelacie, and more Power than We now give to single Presbyters; and have given the Reason why it was so, and of its Consistence with the design of our Reformers, that the perpetual Government of the Church should be by Paritie. The main Difference between the two sorts of Church Rulers which we insist on, and which himself acknowledgeth to be Material, he falleth upon, *p.* 159. and sayeth he *must be serious in it*; is, *Superintendents were made obnoxious to the Tryal and Censures of Ministers within their own Dioces.* The Truth of which, and that it *neither was so with Bishops in the Primitive Church, nor should be so now*, he doth freely Protest; But he putteth his Wit to its utmost stretch, to get a fair Answer to it. He bringeth no less than Five Answers, whereas one good one had been Worth them all. His first Answer hath some what of Ingenuitie in it. He condemneth our Reformers in this; and sayeth, *it was a great Error in their Constitutions*, and declames against it with great Vehemencie, that *Governours should be Subject to the Censure of their Subjects*; and sheweth a great deal of Zeal for absolute Government, both in Church and State: into Debate about which I shall not now enter: only I take Notice, that here he fairly gives up that part of our Controvesie, that he hath been at a vast deal of pains about; that our Reformers were Episcopal in their Principles. With which I am sure, this is wholly inconsistent. If he had thought of this sooner, and Acted consequentially to it, after this Thought came into his Head, he he might have saved a greas deal of pains to himself, and Me and near the Half of his long Book might have been spared. His *second* Answer is,

is, *this was put in their Constitution from a Principle about civil Government owned by them, that the King is Major singulis, but Minor omnibus*: which he also Ridiculeth. Neither am I concerned to Debate this Principle, it doth not belong to our our present Controversie. But what he asserteth is a groundless Conjecture; we have better ground to think that they lookt on this as according to the Laws of the Gospel; which forbiddeth Church Domination. His Third is, *they made also Ministers Censureable by their Elders*; and from thence taketh occasion to Reproach them, as having little Skill in Church Policy: nor will I degress into these Debates; only I take Notice, that what he saith is no Answer to our Exception, but rather a Confirmation of it: if both a *Superintendent* was Censureable by the Synod, and the Ministers by the Eldership; it doth evidentlie follow, that the *Superintendents* and the Bishops power were not the same. A Fourth Answer is, *this was never put in Practice*. Reply, It will be very hard for him to Prove this Negative: but whether it was or not, it sheweth that our Reformers did not intend Episcopacy when they set up *Superintendents*. His Fifth is, *this Constitution doth not infer Parity*. Reply, We do not say that *Superintendents* were in absolute Parity with other Ministers; we confess a disparity of Power, for that time. All we plead is, that our Reformers were not for Episcopacy, even in that case of Necessity: and the Imparity that they were then forc't to; they did not intend should always continue.

§. 23. The other Plea he mentioneth hath its Rise from his own fancie: it was not used by us: what he citeth for it, was not used either for its Advantage, or disadvantage, but an occasional Observation cast into a Parenthesis, to shew that it was merely the Deed of the Church; however, it might afterward be taken notice of by *Parliaments*. Our Author now, *p.* 166. imagining that he hath dispelled all the Mists cast by Presbyterians on what he pleadeth for, about the Principles of our Reformers, with respect to Church Government; proceedeth to give us Accompt of a *second Modell that Church Government was cast into*: But as an Introduction to this, he falleth on the Mistakes and weaknesses of the Reformers, with the Preface of a pretended unwillingness to expose them so; the sincerity of which pretension the Reader may Judge of, if he consider that the whole of this Discourse is wholly Impertinent; for we are to consider their Actions rather than gues at their Motives: if the Reader also reflect on his *page* 7. where he reproacheth our Reformation as *a violent and disordered Reformation*. Their weakness he exposeth

in two things: one is, that *they went on this Principle, that the best way to Reform the Church was to recede as far from the Papists as they could: to have nothing in Communion with them but the essentials, the necessarie and indispensible Articles and Parts of Christian Religion, what else was in its nature indifferent, and not positively and expresly Commanded in the Scripture, if it was in fashion in the Popish Church, was therefore to be laid aside, and avoided as a Corruption, as having been abused, as made Subservient to Superstition and Idolatry.* Here is a false representation of our Reformers, and that in three things. 1. This Principle was never held nor Practised by them, in the Latitude nor extensiveness that he mentioneth: they indeed were against *Religious Ceremonies devised by Men*, as on other Grounds, so on Accompt of their being *Symbols of Idolatrie and Superstition*, and having been so used: but there were many parts of Religon that were not fundamental, but of inferior Note that they did not so deall with. 2. They never Rejected any thing that was truelie a part of true Religion, and was peculiar to it, whether it were of greater or lesser Moment, onlie on the Ground he mentioneth: but always were able to give other Reasons for their Opinion or Practice. 3. They always were willing to receive what could be, by good consequence, proved by Scripture, though it were not positively and expresly Commanded; I advise my Adversarie, if he have little regard to the reputation of the Reformers, that he would be more careful not to Wound his own, by speaking what is not Truth. For the Principle it self, duly stated according to what I have said, I am willing to Debate it with him; but that is not his business, but rather to expose it by Invectives. The next thing that he Representeth them in as weak, is, *they were for the Revenue that had belonged to the Church in Poperie, to be Imployed still for the Churches use.* I think this Debate is little to our purpose, and therefore I wave it,

§ 24. His next Attempt is, to prove that there was a *second Model* of the Government of the Church of *Scotland*, after the publick Establishment of the Reformation; and that this was Episcopacy. And here he bringeth a Labyrinth of History, in which it is hard for any Man to follow him: rejecting what ever disliketh him; and casting Dirt on all that have written the History of our Reformation, not sparing *Spotswood* himself, when he doth not please him: only he hath had the hap to light on a *Manuscript*, out of which he alters, adds, and contradicteth all the other Accounts that we have of the Affairs of our Church; whence that *Manuscript* came, what Authority it hath; whither it be his

his own, or any other Mans, he is not pleased to tell us. He calleth it *his Manuscript*, whether he would have us take him for the Author, or for the Owner of it, I cannot determine: nor do I see what Title he hath to it on either Account; I have the present use of a *Manuscript*, which (as I am credibly informed) is the very individual Copy that he had, which now belongeth to the *University of Glasgow*: Whether any other Copies of it be extant, I am uncertain: It was Transcribed by *William Laing* Reader of *Ebdie* Kirk, in the year 1638. It containeth the Acts of the General Assemblies from 1560 to 1616 inclusive, and other things relating to Church Affairs. I shall in a few Words shew how little Advantage he hath by this *Manuscript*, by shewing that it is far from setting forth our Reformers as enclined to Episcopacy: and by pointing at some of his false Citations out of it; for the former, it will be evident to them who without Byas, consider the following Passages: *Assembly* 1562 *p.* 6. not the *Superintendent* alone, but they with the Ministers and Elders, are to *expone to the Kirk, the State of the Kirk among them, and note Offences; that the Kirk may find some Remeed for them*; *p.* 7. *Superintendents as well as other Ministers are removed, and tryed in Order to Censure by the Assembly*: so also *p.* 8. and almost every where: This looketh not like Episcopal Jurisdiction; *p.* 7. *Sess.* 4. the Assembly giveth Power to *Superintendents, to transport Ministers*, but with this expreis Limitation; that *it be done in the Synod, and with Consent of the most part of the Ministers and Elders. Ibid. Sess.* 3. Speaking of *Inhibiting such as have unduly entered into the Ministry*, it is said, *this Act is to have strength as well against them that are called Bishops, as others, pretending to any Ministry in the Kirk*: Where even the Name of Bishops (as then used) seemeth to be disliked, and their Prelation disowned, and their Subjection to the Ministers met in an Assembly supposed, so far were they from owning sole or superior Jurisdiction in them. *Assembly* 1565. *p.* 21. *Ministers must be tryed* (at their Entry) *by Learned Men of the Kirk, such as are presently the Superintendents appointed thereunto*: where the Perpetuity of the *Superintendents* Office, and Power is disowned: they for the present, not always, were to do that Work: also that their Power is derived from the Assembly, not Divine Institution, is plainly insinuated. *Assembly* 1566. A Petition to the Council with Expostulations against *the Queens restoring the Arch-Bishop of Saint Andrews to his Jurisdiction*: where they affirm that *the Causes for the most part judged by his usurped Authority belong to the true Kirk. Ibid. Bishops, Abbots, &c. warned.*

ned by Superintendents within whose Jurisdiction they lived, to compear before the Kirk to answer for not waiting on their Flocks. Assembly 1567. *Sess.* 4. *p.* 44. *The Bishop of Orkney deprived of all Ministerial Function of the Ministry, for Marrying the Queen to the Earl of Bothwell, a Divorced Adulterer.* On his Repentance he is *restored again to the Ministry of the Word.* No mention of restoring to Episcopal Jurisdiction. The *Manuscript* giveth a very short account of the *Convention at Leith* 1571. *Jan.* 12. where our Author beginneth his *new Model of Episcopacy.* Of the Assembly at *Saint Andrews*, in *March* 6. it hath but little. *Assembly* 1572. at *Perth*, *a Determination against the Names of Arch-Bishops, Deans, &c. as scandalous.* Also that *the Articles at Leith be received but for an Interim. Assembly March* 1. 1572. *Bishops appointed* (as well as others) *to be at the first Meeting of every Assembly, under the Pain of Tinsel of half a years Stipend. Assembly March* 6. 1573. *Bishops admonished to joyn with the Kirk, in her Assemblies*, which it seems some of these Aspiring Men thought below them. And it is Enacted, that *the Power of Bishops should not exceed that of a Superintendent*: And that *Bishops should be subject to the Discipline of the General Assembly. Assembly* 1574. The Bishop of *Dunkel rebuked for Ministration of the Lords Supper on Work days.* They were then so Shy of a fixed and perpetual Prelation among Ministers; that it was Enacted, *Anno* 1575. *p.* 70. at the end, that *to shun Ambition and Inconveniency in the Kirk, Commissioners for Visiting Provinces should be Changed every year.* In the beginning of that *Assembly*, when the Tryal of the Doctrine and Conversation of *Bishops, Superintendents*, and other Ministers was mentioned, *John Dury* one of the Ministers of *Edinburgh, Protested that the Tryal of Bishops prejudge not the Opinion, and Reasons that he, and other Brethren has to oppone against the Office and Name of a Bishop.* This is the highest Pitch that his *new Model* of Episcopacy (as he calleth it) came to from 1571. to 1575, when (we deny not) there was a Declension from the Purity of Church Government, endeavoured by some Courtiers, and Ambitious Church Men, their Tools. But from this time Presbytry began to Revive, and gather Strength, till at last it was fully setled: For in the *Assembly* 1575. it was questioned whether the *Office of Bishops was Founded on the Word of God, p.* 71. and some appointed to Debate on either Side. *Bishops are appointed to chuse a particular Flock, where they must ordinarily Labour. Assembly* 1576. *p.* 71. *Adamson* Presented by the Queen to the Bishoprick of *Saint Andrews* is *called by the Assembly to be tryed, p.* 77. The Bishop of *Glasgow* is *required to take a particular Charge.*

Assembly

Assembly 1577. *p.* 79. *Adamson* Summoned before the General Assembly for Usurping a Bishoprick, *without the Kirk*: Commissioners are appointed to *Examine the Matter, and to Discharge him to Visit any more, till he be Admitted by the Kirk*: *Assembly* 1578. *p.* 83. Ordained that *Bishops be called by their own Names, and called Brethren, p.* 84. The Assembly *dischargeth Creating any more* Bishops *till the next Assembly; because of great Corruptions in the State of* Bishops. *Assembly* 1578. held in *June*, extendeth the foresaid Act *to all time coming, till the Corruptions of the State of* Bishops *be wholly taken away*; And Commands all Bishops that now are, *to Submit to the Assembly under Pain of Excommunication.* Assembly at *Dundee, July* 12. *p.* 96. After Liberty to all to Reason, *The whole Assembly in one Voice, did declare the Office of* Bishops *as now used in Scotland, to be unwarrantable in the Word of God, and unlawful in it self, and to the great Overthrow of the* Kirk *of God.* All Bishops *are Charged to Dimit, and to use no part of the Office of Pastors, without new Admission by the Assembly*: Synods appointed within a Month after to *Summon them, and proceed to Excommunication against the Refusers. Assembly* 1581. Declared the above-mentioned Act to mean, *that the Government of* Bishops, *as now in Scotland, is wholly Condemned.* After which, Presbyteries were Erected through the whole Nation. For his false Citations out of the *Manuscript*, I shall mention but two (tho the Reader may observe many moe, by Comparing his Book with the *Manuscript.*) One is *p.* 127. that the *Manuscript* saith *it was Ordained, Assembly* 1562. *that no Minister leave his Flock to come to the Assembly, unless he have Complaint to make, or be Complained of, or be Warned to it by the Superintendent*; whereas the *Manuscript* hath not a Word to that Purpose in that Assembly: The other is *p.* 128. out of *the Assembly* 1563. *That none Vote in Assemblies but Superintendents, Commissioners, and Ministers brought with them, together with Commissioners of Shires, Burghs, and Universities*: *And that Ministers Commissioners be Chosen at the Synodal Convention, with Consent of the rest of the* Ministers, *and Gentlemen Convened at the Synod.* Whereas the *Manuscript* (it is *p.* 10.) saith, that *every Superintendent within his own Jurisdiction, cause warn the Shires, Towns, and Parish Kirks, to send their Commissioners to the Assembly, declaring to them the Day and Place.* Here is nothing like what he Citeth: and if it were so as he saith, it could not infer the *Superintendents* Nominating the Commissioners to the Assembly: but it is plain that they were Chosen by the Synod: and that the Synods Consent was no less an Act of Authority, than if it had been said, it must be done by their Vote. These things out of that *Manuscript*, I have

have here cast together, because I had finished this Work before it came to my hand, and therefore could not so conveniently dispose them in their several Places.

§ 25. I shall not any further take notice of this Historical Controversie, than to make some short Remarks on it, hoping that a History of these Affairs may ere long be ready for the Press, from which we expect a full Account, with more Truth and Candor, than what is to be found in his Discourse. 1. I deny not (nor do I know any that ever denyed) but there was so much ground for his telling us of a *second Model* of the Government of the Church; that the first Endeavours of the Reformers, for shunning the old Hierarchy that was under Popery, met with some Interruption and Opposition; the Causes were evident, the Covetousness of some Courtiers, and other States Men; and the Ambition and Unfaithfulness of some Church Men: there were Attempts to set up Episcopacy, and they had some degree of effect; but they were always opposed; and the Designs of the Prelatical Party could never succeed, as they wished; but at last, after much Wrestling, Presbytery was settled in its Vigour, in the year 1592. Wherefore his tedious Citations to prove that the Church did some things that cannot well be reconciled with Parity, in that Interval of her Declension and Confusions, was needless Labour, which I do not envy him the Pleasure of, seing he was pleased so to imploy his Leasure Hours; I have elsewhere Debated some of these Passages, with the same Author (if I mistake not) nor do I find any thing that now he bringeth which is new, save insolent Contempt, and ill Words; which I can easily bear from a Man of his Temper; nor will I make equal Returns to these his Complements. 2. I observe, that when *p.* 143. he is giving account of the Alteration that was endeavoured, toward the setting up of Episcopacy; he bringeth Reasons for the States Men, and Reasons for the Church men, that might move them; and that with as much Confidence, as if he had been at the Consult; *the States Men considered that Episcopacy was still established by Law; the Ecclesiasticks made one of the three Estates; and to take it away was to shake the Civil Constitution; and they might have been called to an account for it, when the King should come to Age; who was then Minor*: But this is a pure Fallacy: the Bishops were still by Law possessed of their Temporalities, Revenues, and Parliamentarie Priviledges; but not of their Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction: it was the preserving of these, not of this, that the Courtiers were accountable for, with

with respect to the Civil Constitution. That *this was the best way to preserve the Right of the Church*; is said without Book; unless he can prove that Christ gave her such Rights; her Civil Rights might have been, and afterward were, otherwise preserved. It was very evident, that many of the States Men were Acted by other Motives, (I do not say all of them were for a *Jus Divinum*, or Acted Conscienciously) even to get the Revenues in their hands. Which he doth plainly enough confess, while *page* 189. he telleth us of their *Playing their Tricks, and Robbing the Church*. For the Reason that he maketh the Clergy go upon, *viz.* *The ill Effects of the former Scheme, laid in the first Book of Discipline, that had arisen to the Church*: there is no Hint given by him of any such ill Effects, as apprehended by the Men of that Time; except that they who designed a Change for their own Ends, would readily pretend some such thing; neither he, nor any else, can prove that any Detriment to the true Interests of Religion, did arise from it: It is evident, that some Church Men had a design to advance themselves; though they were disappointed, as to the advantagious part of their design, they got the Titles, and the great Men got the Revenues; which he would fain deny or dissemble: but it is so evident, that he must contradict our plainest Histories, if he deny it. 3. That another was Moderator in the General Assembly, than a Bishop, is brought as an Argument that Prelacy was not got to its height, even by the greatest Efforts the Party could make at that time. All he saith to this is, *that George Buchannan was chosen Moderator in the General Assembly* 1567. *which yet inferreth not the Ruine of Presbytery*. The Strength of this Evasion is soon taken off: the Episcopal Church look on Bishops as so far above Presbyters; that it is Essential to them to Rule, and the Presbyters to be Ruled by them; so that for a Bishop to be a single Member of an Assembly, and a Presbyter to be Moderator, is inconsistent with the Bishops *Prerogative*; but Presbyterians hold no such distinguishing Principle; they think a Minister is in a superior Order above a Non-Preaching Elder: but do not think that the one hath Jurisdiction over the other; but that both have equal Ruling Power: and therefore, though it be now so Customary, that only Ministers preside in our Meetings, that it would be thought odd, if it should be otherwise, yet for a Ruling Elder (such as *Master Buchannan* was) and a Man of his singular Eminency, to preside in a Meeting, is not against any Principle of Presbyterians, that I know of; (tho the Way we use is most Rational, and Decent, and there is no

Reason for receding from it.) But to make this Observation yet stronger, *Calderwood p.* 56. (if I may Name him without Firing this Gentlemans Choller; and being Charged with *Ignorance*, and *knowing no other History*) telleth us, that never one of them had the Credit to be Moderator of the General Assembly; which is a Token (I shall not speak in his Dialect, *an infallible Demonstration*) that their Episcopal Jurisdiction was not then owned by the Church.

§ 26. A fourth Observation I make on his Historical Debate is, that he endeavoureth to prove, against *Petrie* and *Calderwood*; that *the Articles at Leith were approved by the General Assembly; that Episcopacy was so approved; that it cost much Struggling before it could be Abolished.* What he gaineth by all this I know not. The Opposition that was made to that Way did soon appear, and it was soon abolished: that it is said, that *it was not allowed by the General Assembly*, is only meant of the first General Assembly that sat a few Weeks after the Agreement at *Leith*; though afterward the Party grew stronger and got it approved; I know none that asserteth that it was never approved in any General Assembly: though his Proofs that he bringeth for its being approved, might tempt one to think that it was never approved, *viz.* That *they sat in Assemblies, and voted, and that even as Bishops*: Their sitting and voting proveth that they were tollerated: what he meaneth by sitting and voting *as Bishops*, I do not well understand: that Reduplication must either import the Exercise of the Episcopal Authority, or it is a Word without Sense, or Signification: now that they Exercised Episcopal Authority in any of the Assemblies, I do not find, nor doth he attempt to prove it. The Arch-Bishop of *Saint Andrews, being present, and first named in a Committee*, (as *p.* 203.) is such an Argument for Episcopal Preheminence, as the Papists use not a few for *Peters Supremacy*: that *Superintendents are continued (ibid.)* is a weak Argument, for *the Assembly approving Bishops of the second Model*, as he calleth it. It is another such Argument, that *the Assembly declare what they mean by the Names Arch-Bishops, Deans, &c. and wish these changed into Names less offensive*: that *the Articles agreed on at Leith* (which contain his *second Model*) *are voted by the Assembly to be received but for an Interim.* These and some more of the same, or like Importance. are his Arguments for the Approbation of Episcopacy by the Church of *Scotland* at that time. I do not say they Acted as Men for the Divine Right of Parity: it was a time of Temptation, and many yielded too far: but there was a Party that did

not

not thus Comply, and who prevailed to get this Yoke cast off at last: many of the Acts of the Assemblies that he citeth, do Direct the Bishops, and Limit their Power, and appoint them to be subject to the General Assembly; and to have no more Power than *Superintendents* had: this looketh like no good Will to Episcopacy: but a Hedging it in, when they could not, for present, cast it wholly out. But he will prove, *p.* 212, *&c.* That *all this was out of no Dislike to Episcopacy*: and that by *a Petition consisting of nine Articles, drawn by the General Assembly*, 1574. *Wherein Bishops are several times mentioned, and that as Acting as Bishops, in Naming Ministers for Places*; (where yet *Superintendents* and *Commissioners* are also mentioned, as equally concerned in that Work) *yea in one of these Articles, it is desired, that Qualified Ministers might be provided for vacant Bishopricks.* This proveth no more, but that the major part of this Assembly thought fit, that seing Men, bearing the Name of Bishops (for little more they had) were for an *Interim* tollerated in the Church, their Places should neither be vacant, nor filled with insufficient Persons. All this may well consist with a Dislike of that Lordly Power of Bishops that some were Aspiring to, and that my Antagonist pleadeth for.

§ 27. Our Author thinks he hath now done his Work, and proved that *Prelacy was privatly and publickly liked, from the beginning of the Reformation*: it seems he hath argued himself into a Belief of it, (such is the Efficacy of Prejudice) which few else will be perswaded of. He thinketh his further Work needless (and I think it had been more for his Credit to let it alone) it is, to prove that *Presbytery met with Opposition*: and I could seldom observe that any good Design was carried on, but Satan raged against it, and found Instruments against it: his former Historical Discourse he justly calleth *Nauseous*, *p.* 216. But what followeth is much more so; and yet worse: for he falleth to downright Railing against Master *Andrew Melvil*, in not only a nauseous Gingling Strain of Words, but with such Unmanly Bitterness, as a tender Consciened Christian would abhor; yea a Person of common Morality would be ashamed of: and is only fit for the Scolding Women that have lost all Shame. The foull Misrepresentation of Matters of Fact, which have some Semblance of Truth in them, that this Narrative aboundeth with, I leave to the History, that I hope may appear ere long, to correct them: I am no further concerned than with what is Argumentative: of which I can find nothing here: for we deny not that there was then, as

now, an Episcopal Party, who were loath to let go their hoped for, or enjoyed Church Preferments. That after Master *Melvil appeared was the first time that any appeared for Presbytery in Scotland, or against Episcopacy*, is a daring Assertion; after which we may expect whatever he shall think to be for his Intereſt; considering what hath been already adduced out of *the Book of Discipline*. One who readeth this his Historical Discourse, may easily perceive what Shifts he is put to, for proving the *Regent Mortons* Change from Episcopacy, to favour Presbytery; and to prove his Intentions in some of his Actings, and that by a long Train of Arguments. To prove that *England, though Episcopal, did endeavour to promote Presbytery in Scotland. To prove the Ignorance of the Clergy of Scotland at that time.* To prove *Beza to be ignorant of the Government and Constitution of the ancient Church*, (*p.* 248.) and that not out of his own Book, (which it seems he had not read) but out of his Adversary, *Saravia*: and indeed he proveth *Beza's* Ignorance by such Instances as will serve for any Presbyterian, and conclude them all to be *Ignoramus's*, which I know is this Authors Opinion, oftner than once or twice expressed. I pass with a transient Observation, his bitter Sarcasm against Days of Solemn Fasting and Humiliation, often appointed by Presbyterians, *p.* 254. It had been good his own Party had used them oftner; and that they and we had improved them better. I take notice also of his making so very great a Difference, between *the Meetings of Ministers and Elders for Exercises* (that is, for Interpretation of Scripture) *and Presbyteries which were set up*: on account whereof, he representeth it as a great deal of Ignorance in one who affirmed, that *the real Exercise of Presbytery, in all its Meetings, lesser and greater, continued, and was allowed, in the year* 1572. I deny not but that there was a Difference between these two Sorts of Meetings, as there is between a Child and a full grown Man, *viz.* The Meetings for Exercise, or Presbyteries, (call them what ye will) did at first meddle with fewer Acts of Church Power than afterward: yet they Acted with Authority. For the *Ministers and Elders met to interpret Scripture*; I hope the Elders were not Interpreters by publick Teaching, as well as the Ministers: the People, no doubt, were also present at these Exercises, as Hearers; but the Elders are mentioned as Constituent Members of a Meeting, wherein the People had no Share, which must be an Authoritative Meeting. King *James* the sixth was far from his Opinion about these Meetings; who in the Conference at *Hampton-Court* 1603. in the second days Confe-

rence,

rence, p. 78, 79. when Doctor *Reynolds* moved that the Clergy might meet once every three Weeks for *Prophesying*: as Bishop *Grindal* and other Bishops desired of her late Majesty; the King being stirred at this, said, *that they aimed at Scottish Presbytery.* He looketh on it as ridiculous that *G. R.* had reckoned that *Presbyteries were from the beginning*, and fancieth that he hath no other ground for so saying; but that *Calderwood* had said, that *the Kirk of Scotland had four sorts of Assemblies, ever since the beginning*, of which this must needs be one. But I can tell him of other Grounds on which he might reckon this Meeting a Presbytery; one is the General Assembly 1579. as the *Manuscript* he so often citeth, hath it, p. 95. did expressly determine that *these Meetings were Presbyteries*: another is, what is above said: and a third is, that even in times of Episcopacie in *Scotland*; these Meetings were called the Exercise, and yet they pretended to Presbyterial Power in them; though it was in Subordination to the Bishop. That *Calderwood* sayeth that *Presbytries succeeded to these Meetings, importeth no more, but that Presbytries were after set up with more Power and Freedom than they then had under Superintendents, or Bishops.* When he cannot contradict Matter of fact, with respect to the prevailing of Presbytrie; he falleth to down right railing at the Assemblie, which condemned Prelacie, for *boldness, folly, iniquitie, preposterous Zeal*; if more Reproaches had then occurred to his Fancie, it is like we should have had them; it is neither good Manners, nor a token of a good Cause thus to fall from Reasoning to Scolding. I leave him now after he hath again mistaken the Question, to please himself with re-counting his Exploits, and to tell the World what he hath made appear, in not a few *pages*. After which, he bringeth two Witnesses for Confirming what he had so long insisted on; The first of them is, an Author with whom I am not acquainted, but seemeth to be of his own Sentiments; So that what he sayeth of the Opposition made to Presbyterie in *Scotland*; is no more to us than what *A. M. D. D.* himself hath said; especially seing we have not the Reasons, but the bare Assertion, of that Author. The other is *King James the sixth*, to whose Testimonie brought also by the Author of *the Ten Questions*, I did then Oppose, and still do, his own Explication of what he sayeth, in an after Edition of his *Basilicon doron*, that *he meant none but such as Anabaptists, and Familists*: And a contrair Assertion of that same Royal Author, whereby he highly extolleth the Presbyterian Government in *Scotland*; by saying, and that frequently, that *no Error could get footing there* (in *Scotland*.)

land) *while Kirk Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General-Assemblies stood in their Force.* He concludeth his Second Enquiry, with making a great Improvement againſt us (as he thinketh) of our ſaying that the Biſhops ſet up, in that he calleth his *ſecond Model*, had no more Power than *Superintendents*; whence he Argueth, *Superintendents had the eſſentials of Epiſcopal Power; but the Aſſembly at* Dundee, 1580, *condemned Epiſcopacie; and they condemned alſo Superintendencie; whence it followeth, that they (and our preſent Presbytersans follow their Steps in this) not only forſook, but condemned the Principles of our Reformers.* This he ſeemeth to hug as a triumphant Argument, before which the Presbyterian Cauſe can never ſtand. But the Anſwer is plain and eaſie, and may be gathered from what hath been abov-diſcourſed. That Aſſemblie did, (and the Presbyterians do) condemn *Superindendencie*, as what ought not to continue in the Church; nor ought to be in the ordinarie caſes of the Church; but they did not condemn it as what was never lawful to be uſed for a time, in an extraordinarie Exigent. And we affirm (which our Author hath not yet diſproved) that our Reformers were not for *Superintendents* perpetual continuance in the Church.

§. 28. Our Authors Third Enquire is, *whether Prelacie, and the Superioritie of any Office in the Church, above Presbyters was a great and inſupportable Grievance, and Trouble to this Nation, and contrair to the Inclinations of the generalitie of the People, ever ſince the Reformation.* He hath verie juſt Sentiments of this Matter, when he ſayeth that *if his Determination of the former Enquirie be true, this Queſtion will ſoon be diſpatched*; for indeed it hath a great Dependence on what is already Diſcourſed. He might, if ſo it had pleaſed him, ſaved the labour of this tedious Debate, in which there is little elſe but a litigious Jangle, about what can hardly othewiſe be Determined than by what hath been alreadie ſaid; unleſs we could (which is impoſſible) have the Vote by Pole, of all the Individuals of the Nation, and that in all the Times, and Changes ſince the Reformation. The Parliament hath given us their Sentiments about this Matter, and if any be not willing to reſt in the Judgment of ſo wiſe an Aſſemblie of worthy Patriots, come together from all parts of the Nation to conſult about its weghtieſt Affairs, he may, for me, abound in his own ſenſe. I know this hath been generally the thoughts of Presbyterians, yea, of ſober Epiſcopalians in ſome other Churches, and I could give the Opinion of ſome of the greateſt Eminencie for Vertue, Underſtanding and Rouk, (and yet not Presbyterian) that Presbyterie

was

was the fittest Church-Government for *Scotland*. But if our Brethren will maintain he contrarie, I judge they mistake: but shall not think them Hereticks on this accompt. I would have him also consider; that what ever might move the Parliament to make use of this Motive to Abolish Episcopacie, and Establish Presbyterie; the Presbyterian Church of *Scotland* never thought the *Aversion of the People* from Episcopacie, nor their *Inclinations to Presbytrie*, to be the *Fundamental Charter* by which they have a right to that Government. We rejoyce that the State was pleased to allow, and countenance, by their Authority, this Government of the Church; but we think, it standeth on a surer bottom, than either the Opinion or the Authoritie of Men; and much surer than *the Inclinations of the Mob*: even the Institution of Christ declared in the Scriptures of truth; which Grounds I have laid down in this Work; if he can Beat us from these, we shal become his willing Proselyts; and quit (though we will not Revile it as he doth) this Act of Parliament, as no sufficient Ground for our Faith and Practice in this Matter. I know not whether it favoured more of Contempt of the State, or of the Church, or was more designed to ridicule, or to refute Presbyterie, that he Choosed such a Title for his Book as he hath done? but we are *in utrumque paratí*; to despise his Mocking, and to Answer his Material Arguments, though we have neither leasure nor Inclination to Blott so much Paper as he hath done, about Matters that be remote from the main Question.

§. 29. His Proofs of *the Peoples Inclination* towards Bishops are much of a size of strength with what we have already heard, *Petrie* commends the State of the Church in the year 1576: and *Spotswood* speaketh of the Respect that the *Superintendents* had: *Beza* also, and *Knox* rejoyced in that State of the Church: Ans. I believe, so should the Presbyterians of our days have done if they had then Lived: There was a Glorious Reformation that was cause of great Joy, and though *Superintendencie* was no desireable thing in it self, yet in that time of the Churches great Exigence, it was no small Mercie, and Matter of Joy, that there were a few worthy Men to manage the Affairs of the Church, when as many as were needed could not be had; and it was just that these Men should be had in great Esteem: yet it is no good Argument, the People Inclined to have *Superintendents* when it was simply needful, therefore they inclined to have them, or Bishops, perpetuated in the Church. Another great Argument is, even in after times, and the more advanced State of Presby-

Presbyterie, when Ten or Twelve were severely dealt with by the Magistrat and Six or Seven more called to *London*, for their forwardness in that way, *yet all things went peaceably in Scotland*: as if People were always well pleased with what passeth when they make no Disturbance to the Government: he must in Justice allow us the use of the same Argument for the Aversion of all *Scotland* from Episcopacie, and their Inclination to Presbyterie, seing the Nation have these years past, been in Peace, though he, and some of his Partie Complain of the hardest usage that can be. That Episcopacie prevailed, 1610, Proveth no more for the one side, than the prevailing of Paritie, 1592, and again, 1690, Proveth for the other side. Yea, submitting to Episcopacie, so far as to sit in Synods, and Presbyteries with a Bishop, was no Argument of Approving it, in the case of the Church that then was; when the Judicatures of the Church were in their Integritie, and Bishops thrust in on them: It was another Case at the last Erection of Episcopacie, when all Church Meetings were laid aside by Civil Authority, and were called again only by the Bishops Authority. He Chargeth *Calderwood*. (and *G. R.* for the great Crime of following him in this piece of Historie) that he had said, that *it was Statute in Parliament*, 1565, *that no other Jurisdiction Ecclesiastical be acknowledged within this Realm than that which is, and shall be, within this same Kirk, Established presently, or which floweth therefrom, concerning Preaching the Word, Correction of Manners, or Administration of the Sacrament.* If I should Confess that I find not these Words in the Act which *Calderwood* citeth: yet our Author should not have so much Advantage against him, or *G. R.* either, as he Boasteth of; unless he will Condemn his Darling Historian *Spotswood* also: who sayeth, *p.* 214. that *the matter of Policy and Jurisdiction of the Church was reseered to the Consideration of certain Lords delegated by the Estates*: there is as little of this in the Act that he Citeth, as there is of what *Calderwood* had mentioned: whence these two Historians had their vouchers for what they say, it seems my Antagonist cannot tell; nor could I, till I met with an old Edition of *King James the sixths* Acts of Parliament, Printed by *John Ross* at *Edinburgh*, 1575. Where Parliament 1569, *Act* 12, the Words are expressly set down. It seems his Party dreaded the Force of this Citation; and have taken care to stifle it: For in Edition *Edinburgh*, 1682, called the *little Acts of Parliament*, that Act (being the 12*th* Chapter, Parliament, 1567) is wholly left out. That *Superintendencie* was then in the Church; is no Argument that

that Prelacie was settled in the Church; as what was intended should continue; but they were then intending another sort of Jurisdiction, as the event did shew. What he so critically carpeth at, *p.* 293. about a Citation out of *Lesleyes* Historie; is pure quibling; it was not denied that Popish Bishops sat in Parliament, but rather acknowledged; yet *Lesly* was cited to shew that it did not long continue so. If there be any material Change in that Citation from the Authors Words, let the Reader judge; after all the frivolous Critticism he hath made. The Reader may observe how exact a Historian this Man is, who huffily Bantereth others with defectiveness that way: for he telleth us, *that Meeting of which* Lesly *sayeth, that the Ecclesiasticks were Excluded, was not a Parliament; but at most a Privy Council: Lesly* supposeth it to be a Meeting that had the Legislative Power, which I thought had been in the King and Parliament; and that *they made such a Law as was the Fountain of all the Heresies,* (i. e. the Protestant Religion) *and other evils that followed.* That he calleth it *Concilium,* is nothing contrarie to what I say; seing Parliaments are often so called in Latine,

§ 30. For his fourth Enquirie, he manageth his Answer to it, with such undecent Reflection both on the Church and on the State; that I judge others are meeter to deal with him about these things than I, or any in my capacity; and the Matter (as himself confesseth) not being capable of Argument; nor any publick Deed being extant (except the Act of Parliament which he so petulantly exposeth) by which it might be Determined: I see no ground here for Debate, but our Affirmation and his Denial; and I know he will lay no more weight on the one, than we lay on the other. For what he is at a great deal of pains about, to refute what *G. R.* and another who writ the *farther Vindication,* had said very transiently, and without intending a laborious Paper combate about a Matter so remote from the vitals of our Controversie with the Episcopalians, I say, all that Rapsodie that he hath written on this Head, I am content to refer it to the judicious and unbyassed Reader; to consider whether our Cause, or this Authors Reputation as a Wise Man, and one exercised in matters of solid Reason or Learning, do more Suffer by it; it is Truth, and the Ordiances of Christ that I am set for the Defence of, not Men, my self, nor others; unless it were in Matters that may reflect blame on the Cause that I own. Wherefore I shall wholly pass over this Enquirie: if any one who hath more leasure than I have; or is mote inclined toward Eristick jangle, will

take him to Task, and deal with him at his own Weapon, he may do it. I say not this, as either being convinced by his Reasons, or seeing them to be Unanswerable. I am still in the Opinion I was in before, concerning the *Inclinations of the People of Scotland*; especially the Soberer sort of them, and these of the best Lives, with respect to Episcopacie and Presbyterie. Only this *I* confess, that I believe there was never a time since the Reformation in *Scotland* arrived at any degree of Consistence, or Stabilitie, wherein the Inclinations of the Generalitie of the People were less cocerned about any thing of Religion, either the more Essential, or the less Substantial part of it; on the one side, or on the other; so Fatal impressions the Flood-gates of all manner of Profanness, and Looseness that had broken out in the late Times, under Prelacie, had made on the Minds of Men; and to such height Irreligiousness arrived. Yet I Affirm, that the real Respect that Men had to Religion, in any of the concernments of it, were rather on the Presbyterian, than on the Episcopal side. I shall say less of his fifth Enquirie, for I freely confess, that neither *the Inclinations of the People for Presbyterie, nor Episcopacy being a Grievance to the Nation*; nor *our being Reformed by Presbyters*, if all this were true, evident and certain; none of these, nor all of them in conjunction, could by themselves, infer that Prelacie should be Abolished: nor (I am confident) did the Parliament ever intend to have them so considered Wherefore, if my Antagonist, or any for him, can prove that Prelacie is the Ordinance of Christ for the Gospel Church: we shall part with all these Arguments for its Abolition, and shall cordially own it: but if that cannot be done (as I am sure it cannot) and if these Propositions be true; they afford an Argument for the Abolition of Prelacie, that he will never be able to Answer. And I shall dismiss this Enquirie; and indeed this whole Book, after I have Noted a few things (without insisting on Debates) out on a Discourse that he beginneth afresh, *p.* 333. about the *Principles of our Reformers*: he pleadeth for their *fallabilitie*: *he is not for all they held or did*: we say the same of both. Only I take Notice, that here he overthroweth the Argument that he had so much insisted upon against us; that our Reformers were not exactly for the whole of our Way. Though I do not pretend to Defend all the Principles that were held by our Reformers: yet many of these which he blameth them for might easily be Defended; if it were not to Digresse from our present Controversie about Church Government. The Reproaches that he casteth on *Master Knox* deserve Correction; I wish,

wish, some may undertake it. His Challenge to us, p. 344. to *shew wherein they have deserted the Reformers, so far as they Agreed with the Primitive Church, or, what is an Approach toward Poperie*, I say, Episcopacie is an Instance of both: but this being the Matter of our main Debate, the Decision must depend on that. He undertaketh to make it appear that *the present Presbyterians have receded from the Principles of our Reformers, in* 1. *The Faith.* 2. *The Worship.* 3. *The Discipline.* 4. *The Government of the Church.* In stead of this last, he insisteth on their laying aside the Bishops from voting in Parliament. I cannot now degresse to consider what here he sayeth; though he insisteth on them at great length; for I diverted into the Considerations of this Book, onely in so far as the Controversie I have with him (or who ever is the Author in the other Book) is concerned. And there are some of these that are also there Debated, which I intend to consider. I have alreadie said, that we reverence our Reformers; but neither thought their Reformation at first Perfect; nor themselves Infallible. I hope some, or other will take him to Task on these Heads, and Defend the Principles of this Church, from his insolent Obloquie: I wish him a more temperat Spirit than appeareth in his Discourses; and particularly in his Ridiculeing of the Administration of the LORD'S Supper, as it is managed in the Church of *Scotland*.

SECTION IX.

Of Holy Days of Humane Institution.

I Return now to the *Enquirie into the New Opinions*: and proceed to his Third *Chapter*; wherein he pretendeth enquire into several *new Opinions*. The first of which is, that *we are against the Observing the Holy Days, of CHRISTS Nativity, Resurrection, Assention; and Commemorating the Piety, Faith, and Martyrdom of the Saints that are mentioned in Scripture.* We do not denie the Charge, so far as being against the Anniversaries ohservation of these Days doth reach. That this is a *new Opinion* we denie: though at the same time we confess the contrarie Practice is verie old: yet we maintain, that no such thing was injoyned, or practised in the Apostolick Church; which is older than the Church that he Appealeth to. He is too confident when he sayeth, *it is certainly a new Doctrine*; for we are certain on the other hand, that there is Warr-

rant for it in the Word of GOD; as there is for no new Doctrine. He ſayeth, *it flieth in the Face of the whole Chriſtian Church, Antient and Modern, Reformed, and Unreformed*: and other harſh Words he is pleaſed to run us down with. This is Paſſion, not Reaſon. A modeſt Diſſent from a Church or a Perſon, though of the greateſt Veneration that is due to Men, is no *flying in their Face*. And if he will needs call it ſo, our Apologie is, if they flie in the Face of the Holy Scripture, we chuſe rather to Differ from them, than with them to flie in its Face: but we put no ſuch Conſtruction on the Opinions, or Practices of other Churches, Antient or Modern. I am not without hope that it may be made appear, that he and his Complices, *flie in the Face*, both of Antiquitie, and of the Reformed Churches, by their Opinion about Holy Days; and Differ from them more than we do, which will appear when we come to State the Queſtion: which he hath never minded, though he engageth in the Debate with a great deal of warmth. This is *Andalatarum more pugnare*, to Fight in the dark. We are now but in the Threſhold, conſidering the Opinion of other Churches. He will allow us none but the Church of *Geneva*, and that with *Calvines* diſlike, For *Calvines* diſlike of the Abrogation of the Holy Days by the Magiſtrats of *Geneva*, he Citeth two Epiſtles of his; which he doth not diſtinguiſh by their Numbers; ſo that I cannot find them: not being willing, nor at leiſure, to turne over the whole Book for them. But I ſhall more diſtinctly point him to other two of his Epiſtles, wherein, though he doth not fully declare for our Opinion, he doth plainly condemn that of our Prelatiſts. They are, *ad Monſ. Belgradenſes, Ep.* 51. *p.* 112. *edit*: *Hanov.* 1597. and *Manſoni Poppio Ep.* 278. *p.* 520. I ſay the ſame of our Reformers, and of the *French* Proteſtants.

§ 2. I ſhall now addreſs my ſelf to fixing of the true State of the Queſtion. And 1. We do not, with the Anabaptiſts in *Germany* (for ſome Anabaptiſts in this differ from them) and with the *Petro Bruſiani*, cited by *Paræ in Rom.* 14. *Dub.* 4. out of the Life of *Bernhard. lib.* 3. *cap.* 5. diſowne all Holy Days. The Lords Day we owne, as of neceſſity to be obſerved, being of Divine Inſtitution. Pardon a ſmall Digreſſion: I ſee no ground to think that *Peter Bruce* was of this Opinion: all that I find aſcribed to him, *Cent. Magd.* 12. *cap.* 5. and that even by *Petrus Cluniacenſis*, his Antagoniſt, is, *Die Dominica, & aliis, putabat licitum eſſe veſci carnibus.* The *Centuriators* wiſh, *Utinam vero ipſius Petri ſcripta extarent, ex quibus multo rectius facere judicium liceret, quam ex illis qui in defenſionem*

defenſionem Pontificiarum abominationum conſpiraruntt. He was one of theſe famous Witneſſes for the Truth againſt Antichriſt, who went under the Name of *Waldenſes, Albigenſes, &c.* It is like he might diſowne other Holy Days; but there is no ground to think that he diſowned the Lords Day. 2. We maintain it to be unlawful, to obſerve the Jewiſh Holy Days; I ſhould bring Arguments for this: but I think our Adverſaries will hardly contradict this Aſſertion: the Lord having of old appointed theſe Days, and all the legal Rites, for Prefiguring Goſpel Myſteries; and the Apoſtle expreſly condemning this Obſervation: *Gal.* 4. 10. *Col.* 2. 16, 17. where they are expreſly called *Shadows of Things to come.* 3. We hold, that not only theſe Jewiſh Days are not to be obſerved as ſuch, or on Jewiſh Principles; but the Days ought not to be ſet apart as Anniverſary Holy Days, on account of Decency, Policy, and Order, in the Chriſtian Church. All the Arguments will have place here that were uſed by the Primitive Chriſtians againſt them who keep *Eaſter* on the ſame Day with the *Jews.* 4. Our Adverſaries are not one among themſelves about obſerving the Holy Days: ſome count them more Holy than other Days, and hold that *God's extraordinary Works have ſanctified ſome times, and advanced them, ſo that they ought to be, with all Men that Honour God, more Holy than other Days.* So *Hooker Eccleſ. Polic. lib.* 5. §. 60. where he layeth a Foundation for Believing that theſe Days are Holy, and to be obſerved, antecedently to the Churches Inſtitution. Others of them, are of a contrary Opinion, *Couper* Biſhop of *Galloway*, in his Reſolution of ſome Scruples, about the *Articles of Perth*, which are ſet down in the Hiſtory of his Life, *p.* 8. of his Works; hath theſe Words: *in my Mind, no King on Earth, no Church may make a Holy Day; only the Lord who made the Day, hath that Prerogative*: only he ſheweth that *a Day may be ſet apart for Preaching, as the Birth Days of Princes are for Publick Rejoycing, &c.* Our Author hath not told us, which of theſe Opinions he owneth. 5. It is one Queſtion, whither a Day may be ſet apart for Commemoration of ſome Myſtery of our Religion, by Men; and as a part of Gods Worſhip. And another, whither ſuch Days may be ſet apart for Worſhipping God, merely as a piece of good Order and Policy. The firſt the Papiſts are for: the other moſt of our Prelatiſts owne: though ſome of them differ little from the Papiſts in this Matter. 6. The Queſtion is not, whither a Day may be ſet apart occaſionally for Religious Worſhip: that is, when any ſpecial Providence giveth occaſion for Faſting and Humiliation, or for Thankſ-

giving

giving and Rejoycing: ſeing in that Caſe, there is a ſpecial Providential Call to that Solemn Work: but, whither a Day may be ſet apart to be obſerved conſtantly, and as it recurreth every Year. The one maketh a Difference between that Day of the Year, and other Days; and exempteth it altogether; and conſtantly, from Civil Uſe; the other doth not ſo; the one maketh a Difference among Days; the other maketh the Difference only in the Works, or Diſpenſations of God, which occaſioneth ſuch Work on that Day, and not on another. All that the Church doth in the one Caſe, is, whereas the preſent Providence calleth to the Work, as it is expreſſed, *Iſa.* 22. 12. The Church only determineth the Circumſtance of Time; which muſt be done: in the other, the Church determineth more than a neceſſary Circumſtance, *viz.* That there ſhall be ſuch a Solemnity: Which the Lord hath not injoyned, neither do we doubt, but that the Church may appoint recurrent Days for Solemn Worſhip; to wit, while the preſent Providence that calleth to ſuch Work continueth. Weekly, or Monthly Faſts may be appointed under a laſting Calamity or Threatning. 7. One Queſtion is, whither any Anniverſary Holy Days ſhould be allowed, or may be appointed by Man: another, whither any are to be allowed in Commemoration of the Saints: for ſome are for *the great Days*; as they call them; which reſpect Chriſt, and our Redemption; ſuch as the *Nativity, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion*, and ſome others: who are wholly againſt Holy Days that reſpect only the Saints. 8. It is a Queſtion, whither Days may be Dedicated to Saints: as the Papiſts do: and another, whither the Commemoration of Saints may be made on ſet Days: this laſt our Brethren are for: though it will be hard to ſeparate theſe two: of which afterward.

§ 3. I ſhall now ſet down our Opinion, and wherein we differ from others. And firſt, we maintain, that God hath inſtituted the Obſervation of the Weekly Sabbath, as a part of that Religious Worſhip we owe to him. I do not expect that our Brethren will directly, and expreſly controvert this: though ſome of them teach Doctrine not very conſiſtent with it: which belongeth to another Head than what we are now upon. Only I take notice, that they who are moſt for obſerving other Holy Days, do uſually ſhew leaſt Zeal for the ſtrict obſerving of the Lords Day, either in their Principle, or their Practice. 2. I aſſent, that the Lord hath not inſtituted, under the Goſpel, any other recurrent Holy Days, nor enjoyned the Obſervation of them. If

any

any think otherwiſe, they muſt prove what they affirm. 3. The Church hath no Power to inſtitute, or injoy the Obſervation of any recurrent, or Anniverſary Holy Days, for Religious Uſe, without a ſpecial and preſent Occaſion. 4. Any Days that the Church ſetteth apart occaſionally, for Religious Work, are no further Holy, than that Holy Work is the Deſign of their Appointment: they have no Sanctity in themſelves; nor can Men impart it to them. 5. Though we are far from ſevere Cenſuring, either Ancient or Modern Churches, or Perſons, who are for ſome of theſe Holy Days; yet we cannot be of their Sentiment in this: nor look on theſe Days as indifferent things, as ſome of them do. 6. That the Reader may be undeceived about the Opinion of the Reformed Churches, which our Author talketh ſo much of, and blameth us for differing from them: he may know, that our Epiſcopal Brethren are at greater Diſtance from them, in this Matter, than we are: for they condemn the Saints Holy Days: ſo *Paræus in Rom.* 14. *Dub.* 4. ſo *Calvin*, in both the Epiſtles cited, §. 1. The *Helvetick Confeſſion of Faith, cap.* 24. *in Cor. Confeſſ. p.* 54. *Baldwin* citeth *Danæus* diſowning all the Holy Days, in theſe Words; *Dies Chriſto dicatos tollendos exiſtimo, judicoque; quotidie nobis in Evangelii prædicatione naſcitur, circumciditur, moritur, reſurgit Chriſtus. Turretin Theolog. Elenct. loc.* 11. *cap.* 15. Though he allow Liberty enough for obſerving of the Holy Days that relate to Chriſt; yet he determineth the Controverſie about Holy Days far otherwiſe than our Epiſcopal Brethren do: I ſhall tranſcribe his Words: after he hath told us that we ought always to remember Chriſt and his Benefits, and ſhould do it in the Word and Sacraments; he addeth, *ſed (queſtio eſt) an ad ſingulorum illorum beneficiorum & myſteriorum recordationem certi quidem dies feſti, Deo ſacri, annuatim recurrentes, a Chriſtianis quotannis celebrandi ſint? quod nos negamus.* he alſo denyeth theſe Days to be more Holy than others, or a part of Gods Worſhip, or to be Celebrated *ſub ratione myſterii.. Markius* alſo *Compend. cap.* 12. §. 17. He condemneth the Difference of Days that was brought into the Church, from the firſt Chriſtians yearly Commemoration of the Martyrs. When my Antagoniſt hath duly conſidered theſe things, I hope he will not find cauſe to repreſent us as ſo widely differing from the Reformed; and himſelf ſo near to them, as he would now make the World believe. I do not pretend that they are generally, wholly on our Side, in this; for many of them look on the Obſervation of theſe Days as indifferent; in which we cannot aſſent to them. But I know

know of none of them who impoſeth them with ſuch Rigour, and talk ſo highly of the neceſſity of obſerving them, being recommended by the Church; or of the Religion that is in this Obſervation, as the Epiſcopal Party in *England* and *Scotland* do. Our Brethren do alſo ſtand by themſelves, in their keeping of Saints Days: and in the Number of their Holy Days; which in *England* is greater than the Number of theſe that God injoyned to the Jews; forthe Primitive Church, at ſome Diſtance from the Apoſtolick Times, may be they may have ſome Countenance there; yet theſe Saints Days were not then ſo ſo injoyned, and urged, as they urge and impoſe them, nor made ſuch a Yoke to the People; as may be gathered from *Socrates hiſtor. Eccleſ. lib.* 5. *cap.* 22. whoſe Words are, ἐμοὶ δὲ φαίνεται, ὅτι ὅσπερ, *&c. I am of* Opinion, *that as many other things crept in by* Cuſtom, *in diverſe places, ſo the Feaſt of Eaſter prevailed among all People, from a certain private* Cuſtom, *and* Obſervation; *in ſo much that (as I ſaid before) not one of the Apoſtles hath any where preſcribed to any Man, ſo much as one Rule of it; it was obſerved, not by* Canon, *but of* Cuſtom; and afterward he taxeth ſome, *who count Fornication indifferent, and contend about Holy Days, as it were for Life and Death: they deſpiſe the Commands of God, and eſtabliſh Canons of their own.* I ſhall add the Opinion of our Reformers, and the Proteſtant Church of *Scotland*, in her firſt State, and that out of the *hiſt. motuum in regno Scotiæ*, under the borrowed Name of *Iræneus Philaleth. p.* 264, 265. *libro primo diſciplinæ, cap.* 1. *Cenſetur; Feſta Nativitatis, Circumciſionis, Epiphaniæ, &c. Apoſtolorum, Martyrum, & B. Virginis Mariæ penitus abolenda eſſe, cum eorum obſervatio nullibi a Deo in Scripturis imperetur; rogandus itaque Magiſtratus, ut obnitentes civili authoritate coerceat: in Synodo Nationali Edinburgena, anno* 1566. *Major illa Confeſſio Helvetica in omnibus comprobatur, excepto Articulo de diebus Feſtis: porro cum Reformatæ Helveticæ Eccleſiæ, licet Feſta illa celebrent, a Superſtitione Ponttificia ſibi caveant; evidenter colligitur, omnem omni modo dierum illorum obſervationem rejectam fuiſſe ab hujus Eccleſiæ Reformatoribus; quorum Veſtigia preſſerunt Poſteri; nam anno* 1575. *in Synodo Nationale male acceptum fuit; quod Paſtores quidam & Lectores in tractu Abredonenſi Populum convocarent ad Conciones & Preces publicas diebus illis Feſtivis; ac in mandatis datum a Synodo Nationali, anni* 1575. *Eccleſiarum Viſitatoribus, ut interdicerent Paſtoribus Adminiſtrationem S. Cœnæ temporibus illis Feſtivis; quaſi majoris efficaciæ ſint Sacramenta tum celebrata. Denique conſtans hæc fuit Paſtorum omnium ſententia; ſolum diem Dominicum Feſtivum eſſe & Deo ſacrum. Referebant alii Regem Jacobum in Synodo Nationali anni* 1590. *publice Deo gratias egiſſe,*

se, quod Rex esset in Ecclesia totius Orbis purissima; imo quæ Genevensem ipsam superet, nam (inquit) colunt Genevenses Festa Nativitatis & Paschatis, qua autem authoritate id faciant, ipsi viderint. This might allay our Brethrens fierce Zeal for their Holy Days. We judge not others that use them without Superstitious Opinions (though we cannot well separate the Practice of them from External Superstition) and we desire the like Forbearance from others, if we cannot use them; for which I shall now give some Reasons, before I consider my Antagonists further Discourse on this Subject.

§ 4. Our first Reason is, these Days were not instituted by Christ, or his Apostles, nor did they injoyn them to be instituted, nor give Power, or Allowance to the Church to do it afterward: *Ergo*, there is no sufficient Warrant for them. And it cannot be rationally accounted for, that either the Church should impose, in the Matter of Religion especially, or People should be obliged to submit to, what hath no sufficient Warrant. That they were not instituted by Christ nor his Apostles, is beyond doubt: our Adversaries do not pretend that they were: for there is no apparent Ground for such a Thought; and if it could be made appear, the Case were changed: for then they were not the Days that we Debate about. That Christ and his Apostles have given no Warrant to the Church to make such an Institution, we must believe, unless our Adversaries can instruct this Warrant by plain Scripture, or sufficient Consequence from Scripture, or strong Reason, (if Reason can have place in such a Matter of Fact) if it be Answered, the Church hath Warrant from Scripture to appoint what is for *Edification*, and for *Decency* and *Order*; and these Holy Days are such. *Ergo*. I Reply: it is denyed that the Church may appoint whatever is thought fit for Edification; the Lord hath appointed sufficient Means of Grace, and of Edification; and the Church must not devise new Means for that End; but faithfully use the Means that he hath appointed: or if any think that the Church may appoint Means of Edification above what Christ hath appointed, both they accuse Christs Appointments for that End as insufficient, in the Way of outward Means: And they are to shew what Warrant the Church hath for so doing. Beside, that Means of Mens devising are not like to be effectual for Edification, if Means of Gods Appointment be not so effectual, as is hinted, *Luke* 16. 30, 31. If *Moses* and the Prophets, Gods Means, cannot perswade one to believe; the Preaching of one risen from the Dead (a Mean that a Man contrived)

could not do it. As for the Decency, Order, and Policy, that they alledge to warrant the Church to institute Holy Days; these are a necessary, or needless Decency, *&c.* If this last, there can be no warrant for what may effect it; if the first, the former Argument recurreth, that God, by his own Institutions, hath not sufficiently provided for the Necessities of his Church. Again, if we should grant that the Church hath Warrant to provide for all that is necessary to make the Worship of God decent, *&c.* They must also shew us a Warrant to judge what is so necessary; if it be alledged, that the Holy Days are thus necessary, either they must instruct this, and shew us that Scripture, or Nature hath made them necessary, and that the Ordinances of God are undecent, disorderly, *&c.* without them; or the Church doth so determine because she will: and in that Case we require a Warrant for such Lordly Domination over the People of God. If it be further Answered, that the Church hath the same Warrant for appointing these Days, as for appointing occasional Fasts, or Thanksgivings. Reply, Not so. For the Lord himself, by his Providence, calleth to these Exercises, to be Solemnly gone about, on such Occasions: but doth not tell us whither the Fast shall be on Tuesday or Thursday, in this Week, or the next: here is a Circumstance of Time, which must be determined by Men; Nature it self maketh it necessary, supposing the Providential Call of God, to the Work on that Occasion: it is not so with the Holy Days: there is no special Providence occurrent, which calleth to these Solemnities at one time, more than at another. *Obj.* Why hath the Lord left the determining of the time of these occasional Solemnities to the Church, and not of the other also. *Ans.* Because the former could not be determined in Scripture, for all Times, Places, and Occurrences, without Swelling it to a Huge, and Burdensome, and less Useful Bulk; the latter could easily have been determined in the Bible; it is actually done in the Old Testament; and if the Lord had thought such a Determination needful, it had been easie to do it also in the New Testament.

§ 5. Our *second Argument*: Either the Apostles had Warrant from God, to institute these Days, or not; if they had not, how is it imaginable that the Rulers of the Church, who came after them, had such Power granted by God: Though some Exalt Episcopal Power to a Monstruous, and Absurd Height, yet I think none of them have the Confidence to say, that the Bishops, in that do, what the Apostles, in the same Case,

Case, might not do. If they alledge that the Apostles had such Power; then I propose another *Dilemma*; either it was for Edification, that such Days should then have been appointed, as much as it was in after times, or not; if it was, the Apostles were Negligent, or Unfaithful in not appointing them, which is Blasphemy to think, seing in all these things, they were infallibly guided by the Spirit of God: if it was not, our Adversaries are obliged to shew us what was the Necessity of it afterward, which was not in the Apostles Days. I know not what can be Answered to this Argument, except they alledge there was not Occasion in the Apostles Days, for these Appointments; many of the great Things that are to be Commemorated on these Days, falling out afterward Reply, The greatest Things, for which these Days are kept, were then past: Christs Birth, Circumcision, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, the Effusion of the Spirit, also, the Conversion of the Apostles, *Stephens* Martyrdom; and yet no Anniversary Day appointed for any of these: and for the Martyrs that came after, the Apostles could easily have given a Hint that they should be so Honoured: if they had set apart a Day for Remembring the Martyrdom of *Stephen*, and of *James*, this had been Apostolick Example for after Ages; which is a good Warrant for our Practice: whence we may rationally conclude, that they had *not received* this Usage *from the Lord*, seing *they did not deliver it to the Churches*, neither by Precept nor Example: if it be said that there was less need of Commemoration when these things were recent, and Religion in its Vigour. Reply, The Apostles knew they would grow old things, and that all the Means that our Lord himself thought fit for the Remembrance of them, would be needed. Beside, Religion was fallen into some decay, and all the Means that ever were needful, were needed before some of the Apostles went off the Stage. Again, some of the Truths that are Commemorated on these Days, were controverted, and violently opposed, both by Heathens, and Apostate Christians, even while the Apostles lived: and therefore they thought of, and appointed other Means for Preserving and Propagating these Truths, but never minded this.

§ 6. Our *third Reason* is, the Apostle doth expresly condemn the Observation of Days, under the New Testament, as belonging to the Jewish Pedagogy, and unfit for the Christian Church State, *Gal.* 4. 9, 10. *Col.* 2. 16, 17. We know the Lords Day cannot there be comprehended, because it is injoyned by the Lord himself; therefore we must understand

derstand this Prohibition of Days that have no Warrant from the Lord, that are the Appointments of Men. Here they have several Answers at hand, 1. These Places are to be understood of the Jewish Holy Days: these were not to be observed, being now abrogated, and because the thing designed by them is already fulfilled: and the Observation was, on the Matter, a denying that Christ is come. Reply, It is not to be denyed, that here are directly, and especially meant, the Jewish Holy Days: but that they are not the only Days forbidden, I prove, *First*, The Prohibition is general, and without Limitation: therefore no Limitation can be made by Men, but what the Lord himself maketh in the Scripture: which we do not find, except of the Lords Day. *Non distinguendum est, ubi Lex non distinguit*: *Secondly*, Seing the Jewish Days are here forbidden, and no other put in their Room, we have Cause to think that no other are allowed, more than they are: when the Jewish Sacraments were abolished, others are substitute to them: when the Jewish Sabbath was laid aside, another was put in its Place, by Divine Authority, as may be deduced by clear Consequence from Scripture; because the Lord would not have the Gospel Church to be without Sacraments and a Sabbath. But when the Jewish Sacrifices were abolished, other Sacrifices to be offered by the Ministers of the New Testament, are not appointed in their Place, (whatever the Papists say to the contrary) and when the Jewish Days were laid aside, none other were brought in their Stead: because the Lord would have no other Sacrifices, nor Holy Days under the Gospel. *Thirdly*, If the Lord will not be served by the Observation of these Days, which once had the Stamp of his own Authority, is it like that he will be pleased with a Sort of Holy Days that he never injoyned, but are the pure Devices of Man? *Fourthly*, These Days are forbidden on general Grounds, that will reach all Days which are not appointed by the Lord; for *Gal.* 4. These Days are condemned *as Weak and Beggerly Elements*, that is, they have no Force to Edifie, being destitute of Divine Authority, and consequently of the Divine Blessing. And *Col.* 2. they are Comanded, *not to let Men Judge them*, that is impose on them, injoyn such things to be Observed, and Censure them as guilty if they observed them not. So *Hamond in loc.* again, their Submitting to these things is called *a voluntary Humilitie*, and *will Worship*: and it is said of all these Observations (among which these Holy days were) that they were *after the Commandments of Men, and their Doctrines*, and

and that *the Observers of them did not hold the Head, CHRIST*; this was a receding from him as the Head and Law-giver of his Church, and betaking themselves to other Law-givers. (I say not that this Phrase importeth no more than this? now all these Reasons of condemning the Observation of the Jewish Holy Days, do also reach other Holy Days that have no Divine warrant. Another *Answer* to our Argument is, the Apostle condemneth the Observation of these Days as if they were still in Force by Divine Command, and were not Abrogated by the coming of Christ; but not simply as if they might not be observed for the Churches Authority injoyning them. *Reply*, This is to make a sense for the Text, not to find it in the Text it self: they are simply forbidden, without any such restricted sense. Again, if the LORD hath laid aside what himself hath once Appointed for a special use, it is strange that Men should revive that again, and bring it again into the Church for another use: especially, when the LORD himself hath Appointed other Means, and not these, for that other use: he hath laid aside the Jewish Holy days which Represented CHRIST to come: and he hath Appointed the Word and Sacraments to keep us in mind that he is come, and what he hath done for us: but our Episcopal Men are not content with that, but they will revive some of the old Jewish days, as *Easter*, *&c.* to keep us in Memorie of CHRIST alreadie come. *Answer Thirdly*, they say we must not observe these Days as the *Jews* did, with a Superstitious Opinion of Worship, or as if they were in themselves Holier than other days? yet we may Observe them for keeping up Order and good Policie in the Church. *Reply*, The weakness of this Plea is alreadie discovered. All the Order, Decencie and Policie that the LORD requireth in his Church may be obtained without them; as the Patrons of them do, on the Matter, confess; when they tell us that these, and all the rest of the Ceremonies, are in themselves, and antecedently to the Churches imposing them, indifferent. Beside, not the Principle only, or the Opinion that Men have about these Days, is condemned in these Scriptures; but the Practice it self.

§. 7. Our *Fourth Reason* is, the imposing of the Holy Days doth derogate from that Christian Libertie that the LORD hath given to his People; which the LORD doth not allow, *Gal.* 5. 1. They are contrarie to this Libertie two ways. 1. It is the Libertie of Christians to be under no Yoke in matters of Religion (we refuse not civil Subjection to our Rulers in all lawful things) but that of Christ; to have him for their only

only Law-giver, *James* 4.12. He hath not given Power to Men to make new Laws for his Church, but to declare his Laws; and to Execute his Censures that he hath Appointed on the Breakers of them. Wherefore, when Christ hath given us one Holy day to be perpetually Observed, and no more; if Men will enjoyn moe Days, they make Laws of their own, and bring the People under their Yoke; which is not Christs. And the Places last Cited do evidently Import this: The *LORD* had now delivered his People from the Yoke of Ceremonies which himself had laid on them, and the false Apostles were endeavouring to wreath that Yoke still on their Necks: and it is as much Bondage, if any will wreath another Yoke upon them which is none of Christs: now that Scripture biddeth them beware of such Yokes. 2. The fourth Commandment alloweth the People of GOD six days of the Week for their lawful worldly Imployments: this Instituting of Holy days Abridgeth that Libertie, and that merely by the Authoritie of Men. It is not so when occasional Solemnities are Appointed; because the Religious, Solemn Work (on which abstinencie from Labour doth necessarily follow) is determined by the Lord, and intimated to us by his Providence; the Church doth no more but Chuse this *Day*, rather than that; If it be said, that Magistrats may Restrain People from their Work for civil Causes; why not then for Religious Reasons. *Answer*, Men have not the the same Power in Religion as in Civil Things; though restraint from Work is the same in both; so is not the occasion; the one must be chosen by the *LORD*; the other may by Men. Beside, that Magistrats must have some good Ground, for such Restraint; otherwise they will not be appointed of *GOD*, though obeyed by the People, I might here add all the Arguments that we commonly use against Humane Ceremonies in Religion; that it is an Addition to the Word or Rule that *GOD* hath managed the Affairs of His house by. A symbolizing with the Papists, without Necessitie. It is Superstition, being above and beyond what *GOD* hath Enjoyned, *&c.* I shall only adde that the Scripture calleth the weekly Sabbath, *the LORDS Day*, as a Name of distinction from other Days: but it could be no distinguishing Name, if the Nativitie, Circumcision, *&c.* were all Dedicated to our *LORD*; for every one of these were the *LORDS Day*, as well as it; And therefore, when *John* said he *was in the Spirit on the* LORDS *Day*, we could not know whether it was *Christmas* day, or *Easter*-day; or Good *Friday*, or the first of *January*, the Circumcision Day, or some ordinary first day of the Week.

§ 8.

§. 8. I come now to Examine what my Antagoniſt bringeth for his Holy Days, and againſt our Opinion. He ſayeth, *p.* 169. *they were Originally appointed to Commemorat the Myſteries of our Redemption, with all poſſible Zeal, gratitude and Solemnity.* If he can ſhew us that Chriſt or his Apoſtles appointed them for theſe Ends: we ſhall lay our hand on our Mouth, and not mutter againſt them; but if they be ſo Appointed by Men, we ask *quo warranto?* CHRIST himſelf hath appointed Ordinances for theſe Ends: particularly, the LORD'S Supper is Inſtituted as a Commemoration of the Myſteries of our Redemption: *this do in remembrance of Me*: if he hath ſaid ſo of any of the Controverted Holy Days we ſhall receive them. But I deſire to know what Power the ordinarie Paſtors of the Church have to Inſtitute ſpecial Ordinances for commemorating the Myſteries of our Redemption. I ſhall further Debate this with him, by and by. Mean while I obſerve, that he is beyond many of his Brethren, who diſown the Myſterie of theſe Days, and all Religious Worſhip, in the Obſervation of them, and ſet them no higher, than that they are for Decencie, Order, and Policie; And himſelf, ſome times when it is for his purpoſe, ſeemeth to be of the ſame mind, as *p.* 170. he frameth an Objection to himſelf; from the Abuſe of them; which alas, is too notour, and groſs, and frequent. His Anſwer is, *ſo may the moſt Holy Exerciſes, and the higheſt Myſteries; and there is nothing ſo Sacred in Religion, or ſo univerſally uſeful in Nature, againſt which ſome ſuch Objection may not be ſtarted.* I do much wonder that a Man of his pretenſions to Learning and Reading, and who doth ſo ſuperciliouſly deſpiſe others for defectiveneſs in both, ſhould ſo ſuperficially Propoſe, & ſo ſlightly Anſwer an Argument that hath been ſo much inſiſted on, and his Anſwer ſo fully refuted. Doth he not know, if he hath Read any thing of the Controverſie about Ceremonies; that the Presbyterians never pleaded that Holy Exerciſes, Myſteries of Religion, or things univerſally uſeful in Nature; yea, or what hath the Stamp of Divine Authoritie were it never ſo ſmall, ſhould be Abandoned becauſe Abuſed: The Abuſe ſhould be Reformed, and the thing retained: But this our Argument ſpeaketh only of indifferent things, which have no intrinſick Neceſſitie, nor Command of GOD to injoyn them, theſe we ſay, (and have often Proved it) ſhould be removed, when groſly, and frequently Abuſed; and that the Holy Days are ſo indifferent, I think he will not deny, if he do deny it, he is obliged to prove the Neceſſitie of them, not only againſt the Presbyterians, but alſo againſt his own Partie, who reckon them

them among the Indifferent things, the Regulating of which, is in the Courches Power.

§ 9. I now Conſider his Debate with the *Vindicator of the Kirk*, (as he calleth him) about this verie Matter; and particularly, about obſerving the anniverſſary Feaſt of CHRISTS Nativity, which we call *Chriſtmaſs*. The Reader who is at pains to Compare that Book, from p. 27. with what my Antagoniſt here ſayeth againſt it, will find, that the moſt part, and the moſt material Paſſages, and what is moſt Argumentative in that Book, to this purpoſe, are paſſed over in ſilence: and but a few things touched. The *firſt* thing he is pleaſed to Notice is, I had ſaid, *the Queſtion is not about the Commemoration of it*, (the Nativity of CHRIST) *but whether this Commemoration ſhould be by an Ordinance of GOD; or by an Appointment of Men.* The occaſion of this State of the Queſtion was, he had asked; *might not the Church take care that this Glorious Myſtery ſhould not be forgotten.* I Anſwered, *no doubt it might, and ſhould*: and I had mentioned the Word, and Sacraments, as GODS Appointment for this End; on which followeth the Queſtion above ſet down. His Anſwer in this Book, to that Queſtion is long, and made up of a great many Sentences, which I cannot well ſee the Connection of, nor pertinency to the preſent purpoſe (may be another may.) He firſt ſayeth, *what the Church doth in this is agreeable to the Will of GOD.* If it be ſo, our Controverſie is at an End: and I will crave him Pardon for all I have written on this Subject, But it might have been expected that this Aſſertion, (which is the Determination of our Queſtion; which he fairly beggeth) ſhould have been Proved; but he thinketh not fit to attempt that. But inſtead of Proof, we have it over again, in other and moe Words, (for he wiſely conſidered, that ſaying it once, and ſo barely was not enough to perſwade the Stubborn Presbyterians) *And if* (ſayeth he) *the manner of Commemoration* (*viz.* by an Anniverſarie Solemnity) *be the immediate reſult of Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution, the Church medled with no more than what was left by our Saviour, to her Power to determine.* Still I deſiderate Proof for what is ſo confidently Aſſerted; and is indeed the το ζητουμενον. If he can ſhew, by any good topick, that CHRIST left ſuch a Power to his Church, we ſhall Debate no more with him: that ſhould in all reaſon Command our heartie Aſſent. What followeth I cannot refute, for I cannot underſtand it (which, may be, is my Dulneſs.) *It is, things indifferent in their Nature do generally carry in them the Advantages, and Encouragements of Neceſſary things.* If this be true, it is Myſtical: it may

poſſibly

possiby have a hidden Sense; If I may adventure to guess at this Riddle, he supposeth, the Appointing of Holy Days to be an indifferent thing: I cannot reconcile this with what he sayeth in the former *page*, that *they were originally appointed to Communicate the great Mysteries of our Redemption, with all possible Zeal, Gratitude and Solemnitie.* What is conducive to so great Ends, and is for so necessarie Uses, I see not how it can be in its own nature indifferent; far less can I make it consistent with what he saith in his *Apologie for the Clergie* p. 41. 42. *do not we see that all Nations agree in this, that publick Solemnities, and Anniversarie Festivities are necessarie to the Beeing and beautie of Religion*: how he will reconcile *necessarie to the beeing of Religon*, and *indifferent*; is beyond my Capacitie. As little can I understand how that can be indifferent in its own nature which hath in it (that is in its Nature) the *Advantages and Encouragements of a necessarie Thing*. I wish he had Instanced in some of the Things comprehended under his large Word *generally*, which have *some Advantages and Encouragements* in them. Many Instances may be brought to the contrarie; as, whether he walk a Mile on foot; or Ride on Horseback, or go in Coach: whether *Tuesday* or *Wednesday* be appointed for the Weekly Sermon: whether Sermon shall begin on the LORD'S Day at Nine or Ten of the Clock; whether the Pulpit stand toward the East or West; *&c.* what *Advantage or Incouragement of necessarie Things* is in anie of these? If he will shew us anie *Encouragement or Advantage* of *any necessarie Thing* (and if that *Encouragement or Advantage* to that *necessarie Thing* be it self Necessarie) to be in the Holy Days; we shall look on them, not as the Appointments of the Church; (for it is to be supposed that this Necessitie is Antecedent to that, and doth not flow from it) but either of Divine Institution, or of Natural Necessitie: neither of which, I suppose, he will ascribe to the Holy Days.

§. 10. Another mystical Sentence followeth; *GOD will have our Obedience approved in indifferent Things, as well as Necessarie; for Necessarie Things are approved for their intrinsick Excellencie; the other are by way of Consequence and Relation.* Here also *Œdipus* himself might be puzled to find out the Sense. So far as I reach his Meaning, I shall Examine what is asserted. I verie well understand that GOD will prove our Obedience to Himself in indifferent as well as in necessarie Things, (if there be anie thing necessarie antecedentlie to His will) but that our Obedience to Man, must be so Proved, or that our Obedience to Church-Rulers is approved of GOD, when they enjoyn indifferent Things, in

the Matters of Religion, to that I cannot assent; and if I could, I should not scruple the implicite Obedience that some require. Is it by Chance or by some inward Byasse that this Author stumbleth so often into Popish Principles? Before I assent to him in this, he must Prove that the LORD hath given the Church Power to injoyn indifferent Things which are parts of Religion, as the Holy Days are: next that we are obliged to Obey in Matters of Religion, what GOD hath left indifferent, but Men have thought fit to impose. What he Meaneth when he saith, the other (indifferent Things) *are by Consequence and Relation*: doth yet more puzle me. What is that Consequence, or what the Relation, for which indifferent things are approved as Necessarie Things are for their intrinsick Excellencies: this I cannot guess at. He cannot Mean that they are approved, because they are only consequential to Necessarie Things: for if that Consequence be Necessarie, it maketh the Things to be Necessarie, and to cease to be indifferent: if it be not Necessarie, but the Necessarie Things may do well without them, it can no way make them more approved than if there we no such Consequence. For their Relation to Necessaries Things, how can it make them approved? if this he Mean, and if this Principle hold, the Papists have a notable Foundation for the Holiness of their Relicts; and indeed, on this Principle it is Built: they are therefore Holy, because the Persons to whom they were related were so: may not relation transfuse a Holiness into his Coat, his Shoe, or what else was about him, as well as either the Birth of CHRIST transfuseth a Holiness into all the recurrent Days of all Years that Answer to that Day on which he was Born: or if he make the Relation of these Days to be to the Holy Exercises performed in them: shall everie time and everie place where there hath been Preaching, Prayer, and Celebration of the LORD'S Supper, *&c.* be ever after that Holy and Approved of GOD: this is strange Doctrine. He goeth on: *when we Commemorate the Nativitie, we Worship GOD and adore His Love that sent His Son into the World: and the Church Commands that this should be performed with all possible Solemnitie at some stated and fixed Seasons*: all this is true: But how doth this Prove his Point; we question the Churches Power to appoint fixed and stated Days for this Commemorating Worship, and maintain that Christ hath appointed Ordinances of his own for this Commemoration, and he telleth us, the Church hath Commanded it also to be done: and there is an End.

§ 11.

§. 11. He next bringeth somewhat like Reason: *the Church may appoint these Seasons (which are but Circumstances of time) as well as the Jewish Church appointed the Hours of Prayer: at which the Apostles were present,* Acts 2. 15. *and* 3. 1. *for which there was no immediate and expres's Institution of GOD, but were kept by an Appointment and Custom of their own.* *Ans.* 1. He doth injuriously insinuate that we require an immediate and expres's Institution for the Days that we will observe; where have we ever said so? let him Prove an Institution, either by expres's Words, or good Consequence, or Apostolick example; or by anie good *Medium*, and we shall acquiesce. 2. The Appointing Holy Days is more than *determining a Circumstance of Time.* It is a sequestering of these Days perpetually from Civil, to Sacred Use; it is to give them a relative Holiness, as far as Mans power can reach; by making a Connection between them and the Solemn Exercises of Religion: it is a Dedication of such a part of our time to *GOD*; so as we do not Dedicate other Days of our time; and so making a difference among Days; which we think can only be done by Divine Authoritie: the Apostles, *Rom.* 14. 5. counted it a weakness in some, who did no more than what our Author putteth off thus slightlie; what they did was, ὁς μὲν κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν. They *distinguished days* one from another; and that with respect to Religion; which could not be without judging one of them better, and more Holy than another; and so it is Expounded by *Erasmus*, and *Vatablus*: *Estius* turneth it, *eligit unum præ alio*, is this no more but determining a Circumstance? Beside, the Lord hath not left it to us to determine Circumstances of Worship as we please, but when it is Necessarie that a Circumstance that relateth to Worship must be determined, and it is not determined by the Lord in Scripture, in that case Men may, and must Determine it; but this is not the Case in hand: there is no need that a stated Day be determined for Commemorating anie of the Mysteries of our Redemption; seing the Lord himself hath appointed his own Day for that End, and his Ordinances as the Means of that Commemoration. 3. For the Jewish Church, *appointing hours of Prayer*: It is to be Considered, that Prayer was joyned with the daily Sacrifice. And these *Hours of Prayer* were appointed by God, not the Church. It is true, *Maimonides* giveth account of three times of Prayer that the *Jewes* were obliged to Observe everie day, and on their Festivities they added a Fourth: but this was in the degenerat times of their Church; as the Papists have their Canonoical hours; *Maimonides* indeed telleth us that

Esdras made Forms of Prayer, and they appointed the Number of Prayers according to the Number of the Sacrifices: but it cannot be Proved that these Constitutions were of that Antiquitie.

§. 12. He further reasoneth thus, *p.* 171. *there is something Analogical in the Christian Church to the Free-will Offerings of the Jews which are not the less Acceptable because Voluntarie: but rather the more, as long as they are within the Circle of these things which he hath Commanded.* Ans. If we give Scope to our fancie to frame Analogies, and make these a Warrant for modes of Religious Worship, there shall be no end of devising new Ways of Worshipping God, while yet Men keep within the Compass of what is Commanded, as to the Substance of their Service. In this case the most fancieful Contriver, and Inventer of what is New, fine, and gaudie, shall be the best *Divine*: and there shall be no end of Contention: for what this Bishop thinketh a fine way, and Anological to what is Commanded, another shall think unfit: We have cause to bless the Lord that he hath given us a more sure Rule for our *Direction*, even the Scripture. 2. These Days Invented by Men are not Analogical to the Free-will-offerings of the Jewes: for these were Commanded in general, and a Warrant given for them, and Directions given how they should be Managed. *Levit.* 1. 3. and 3. 16. and manie other places: nothing of this can be said of the Holy Days; People may Pray as oft as they will, and so may the Church meet as oft as she will for Religious Service, as the Jews might Offer as oft as they pleased: but the Jews were never allowed to set up stated Days, and to separate them from other Days for their Free-will-offerings: no more are Christians allowed to do so with respect to Prayers and Praises. 3. If Modes of Worship, or stated Days for them, be not less Acceptable because Voluntarie, there could be no such thing as *Will Worship*; which yet the Scripture condemneth: and it were not Worshipping GOD in vain to *Teach for Doctrine, the Commandments of Men* (*viz.* about Religious Worship) which is contrary to *Matth.* 15. 9. I confess, Prayer and Praises are not the less accepted because Voluntarie: for these are Commanded Duties: but to separate Days from Common use to these Exercises, and that without special occasion, and constantly, when GOD hath appointed a recurrent Day for that end; this is not Commanded in general, nor in particular: nor hath any Analogie with the Jewish Free-will-offerings: this we Assert, not to be within the Power of the Church: if he think it is, he must Prove it. He sayeth, *the Doctrine of Presby-*

Presbyterians is contrary to all Christian Churches, and he telleth us of Citations to this purpose by *Durellus*: No doubt there may be many Citiations brought of Churches differing from us: but such an universal Assertion cannot be Proved by a Thousand Instances; if we can bring one instance to the contrary: and for this we adduce the Apostolick Church: I have also §. 4. mentioned Churches, and Learned Men in them, who are as far from his Opinion, in the Matter of Holy Days, as from ours. I shall now add some more: *Luther. lib. ad Nobilitatem Germanicam, Art. 5. consultum esse ut omnia Festa aboliantur, præter diem Dominicum.* And *lib. de bonis operibus, Utinam* (saith he) *apud Christianos nullum esset Festum nisi dies Dominicus.* That *Calvin* was really against them all, though for Peace he yielded to some few of them, I have shewed above. *Bucer, in Math. 12. p. 118.* hath these Words, *Ferias alias, sive Dei-pari Virginis, sive Christi, sive Sanctorum Nomine commendatæ sint, optarem abrogatas universas.* And he bringeth strong Reasons for his Opinion, while he addeth: *Primum enim constat, nullo Dei verbo invectas: ubi enim in Apostolicis Scriptis aliquid de Natali Christi, de Epiphania, & similibus? facile crediderim Zelo Dei a veteribus introductas, qua Ferias Ethnicorum, seu clavum clavo pellerent, sed quis dicet hunc Zelum secundum Scripturam, qui omni adeo verbo, & Exemplo Scripturæ careat; mereque rationem humanam secuta est: Alting. in Exeges. Confess. August. Art. 15. p. 93.* giveth account that the *Lutherans* objected to the *Zuinglians*, that they had no Holy Days except the Lords Day. I hope hereare some Christian Churches on our side: *Danæus* (beside what I have cited out of him before) hath these Words, *Eth. Christian. lib. 2. cap. cap. 10. Nobis hodie eosdem dies observare nihil necesse est.* And after, *Itaque, neque dies illos colere, aut observare necesse est, aut operæ prætium.* And below, *Apparet quanta superstitio postea inducta sit, & multitudo istorum dierum Festorum, ut omnino tolli satius sit.* *Thes. Salmur. in a Disputation* on this Subject, by *Capellus*, commends these Churches, which in their Reformation, did quite abolish them, (it is evident then, that such Churches there were: and we are not contrary to all Christian Churches) and he giveth his Reason, *in religione enim, quando vel tantillum a Dei præscripto discedit ur; & homines aliquid sibi licere volunt, aut putant, omnia tuta timenda sunt, siquidem experientiâ comprobatum est, a quam exiguis, & imperceptibilibus initiis, mirus factus sit in Idololatriam, & horrendam superstitionem in Ecclesia Pontificia progressus.* And after, *Ut satius esse videatur, bono aliquo utili, sed minus necessario carere, quam ex illius usu incurrere in grave grandis alicujus mali periculum.* Here I confess this Author doth not expressly condemn the

Holy

Holy Days as simply unlawful, yet he is far from allowing them: *River* on the fourth Command discourseth to the same purpose. I find also cited, *Constitutiones Dordraci*, 1578. Where are these Words. *optandum esset libertatem sex diebus operandi a Deo concessam in Ecclesiis retineri, & solum diem Dominicum feriatum esse?* What is said may sufficiently evince that Presbyterians in this, are not so Antarctick to all the World as he imagineth: though it is their Principle to take the Apostolick Church, and none other for their Guide; yet with due respect to all other sound Churches, both Ancient and Modern.

§ 13. He passeth over in silence not a few of the most material Passages, and what is truly Argumentative, in the Book that he hath now under Consideration; and pitcheth on two Instances that he had given, and I had Answered, of Anniversary Holy Days instituted by the Jewish Church; whence he pleadeth that the Christian Church may do the like; the first is *the Fasts mentioned, Zech.* 15. The Answer to this was given, 1. *God disowned these Fasts, and if it be alledged that they were disowned, only on Account of Neglect of Seriousness in Managing them, that must be proved.* His Reply is, *He leaves us to Guess what Word of Scripture he buildeth this Fancy upon.* I crave him Pardon for that Omission; himself supplieth it, *p.* 173. it is *verse* 5. *Did ye Fast to me.* He saith, *that imports only that they were Careless, &c. in their Publick Appearance before God*; and sheweth that *as much, or more hath been said of Solemnities that Christ himself appointed*; all which we deny not; neither do I doubt that so much is imported, yea and mainly aimed at, in that Passage. Their Profaneness and Irreligiousness did bear more Bulk in the Prophets Eye than their Superstition. I indeed call for Proof that no more is here reproved, but their wrong Way of going about these Fasts. And I give this Reason for that Demand: though it is a Negative that is to be proved, as he stateth it. He bringeth an Argument from a Practice which God expresly disowneth. It is evident that there was Sinful Evil in this Action; he must then prove that there was also some Good in the Action; otherwise he can draw no Argument from it to prove its Acceptableness; the Management of this Solemnity was Evil; that cannot prove these Holy Days to have been accepted; for on that account expresly they are disowned: the Controversie is about the Authority by which they were appointed; to wit, the Churches; we say that could never make them Good: he saith it doth: here is then an Affirmative that he must prove: But to please him, for this once, I shall prove,

prove, that these Fasts are disowned on this account also: though it be not here expressed. This Action is simply condemned, *viz.* their Fasting: the Lord looketh not on it as *done to Him*: therefore all the Sinfulness that is in it; is to be lookt on as the Ground of this Disowning: that want of Divine Institution was one part of the Sinfulness of it, I prove, because in general (under which this Particular is comprehended) all Religious Acts, or Solemnities which have no Divine Authority are condemned, *Matth.* 15. 9. and by other Grounds that I have above laid down. If there be two or more Sorts of Immorality in one Action: no doubt both are condemned in that Action, though but one of them be expressed; as in this Instance, *Jer.* 7. 31. in that Infanticide, there was Idolatry, and most Unnatural Murther, and also Will-Worship, the Action is simply condemned; but only the Evil of Will-Worship is mentioned, *which thing I Commanded not, neither came it into my Mind*: will any say that the other Evils of that Action are not condemned; nor the Action for them, because they are not mentioned in that Place. Wherefore, from an Action so positively condemned, he can make no Argument for its Lawfulness, (which is our Debate about the Fasts) unless he can, *aliunde*, prove, that this was no Fault in that Action, that it had no Divine Authority; for to suppose it, is to take for granted what is the Matter of our Debate. From all this it appeareth, that he hath no Ground to say, that *if the Jews had had regard to the Moral Institutions, their Solemn Fasts had been acceptable to God*, though appointed by Humane Authority: neither is there Cause to reject this Exposition as new, seing there is such Ground for it. He next taketh notice of another Answer given to his Objection, *The Prophets had many things of greater Moment to reprove, and insist particularly on, that they contented themselves to comprehend such things as these under general Reproofs.* Hence he infers, that these were not particularly reproved. What Advantage were it to him, if this were granted; is it not enough that they are clearly condemned in general general Terms. But this Consequence we will not yield: it only followeth, that other things of more Moment are, in some Places of Scripture, mentioned, when these are not. But there are particular Reproofs of these in other Places, as hath been above shewed, and will more appear anone.

§ 14. I shall now adduce another Answer to his Argument; which might take off its Force, supposing that these Fasts were not condemned by the Lord, (which yet I do not grant) but approved. They were

apppointed

appointed under a preſent Calamity, and Providential Call from the Lord, *viz.* the Captivity, and Deſolation of *Judea*, and the Temple. Here was a Call to extraordinary Faſting on that Occaſion; and they only determined the Circumſtance of Time, which was not determined by the Lord, nor any other Appointment was made by God, which might ſupercede this recurrent Solemnity. Now that the Church appointed theſe Solemnities merely for that Ocaſion, appeareth from their Enquiry about the Continuance of them, now that Calamity was over. Some might plead long Cuſtom on the one hand, others with more Reaſon, might plead, that the Cauſe being taken away, the Effect ſhould ceaſe; as *Calvin*, on the Place obſerveth: This cannot be ſaid of our Holy Days, which are appointed to Perpetuity; and without any determined End; and alſo for the Ends theſe are deſigned for, (I mean our Holy Days) the Lord hath appointed other Ordinances, and not left it to Men to deviſe Ways to Commemorate theſe Mercies. I add yet another Anſwer, theſe Faſts were appointed in a very corrupt Time, and State of the Church, which cannot afford us a binding Example; and we have no Ground to think, that in the Churches Recovery in *Ezra's* Time, theſe Faſts were continued: what Light we have from *Zech.* 7. inclineth to the contrary. I had brought two Inſtances of Solemn Times of Humane Inſtitution being condemned, which he next examineth, *p.* 175. *&c.* 1 *Kings* 12. 33. Where *Jeroboam* is condemned for appointing a Holy Day, that God had not inſtituted. His Anſwer to this is, that *this is to Diſguiſe Scripture Hiſtory: Jeroboam is reproved for Idolatry, and Worſhipping the Calves; but if he had appointed a Feaſt in Honour of the true God, and commanded the People to offer their Sacrifices at Jeruſalem, he ought not to have been blamed.* To this I Reply, that this is a very ſurpriſing Anſwer, and I know not that any beſide himſelf, hath ever made bold with Religious Inſtitutions at this Rate: for here is a wide Door opened for all the Devices of Men that do not directly Claſh with any particular Appointment of God; and that both in the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church. And if this Doctrine be received, no Ceremonies that either the Apoſtate Jewiſh Church, before Chriſt's Incarnation, or that the Antichriſtian Church in the Days of the Goſpel hath introduced, can be condemned; let them appoint and do what they will, only keep from a Siniſter Opinion about the Value, or Neceſſity of theſe Devices of Men: And if this Principle be good, why might not *Jeroboam* appoint other Places for Sacrifices beſide *Jeruſalem*,

not

not hindring Sacrifices to be offered there too as well as appoint Feasts beside these that the Lord hath appointed, not condemning the Observance of these of Divine Institution. Further, *Jeroboams* Feast is expresly condemned on this Formal Reason, that the Time was *Devised* (בָּרָא Created) *of his own Heart*, he made it of nothing, there being no Ground for it by Gods Anthority. Now according to this Learned Author, Men may Create as many of these Days as they will, provided they design to Worship the true God on them. *It is a strange Dream* (to use his own Word) to clear *Jeroboam* from Guilt on that Account, for which he is so expresly condemned; no doubt he Sinned highly in his Idolatry; but that he was Innocent in *Devising* this new Feast, is a *new Opinion*, beyond these which this Author is *Enquiring* into.

§ 15. The other Scripture brought to condemn these Solemnities not instituted by God, and yet made Anniversary by Men, is, *Matth.* 15. 9, *In vain do they Worship me, Teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.* We think this a plain enough Scripture to condem all Humane Religious Ceremonies, in general, and Anniversary Holy Days that have no Divine Warrant, as a *Species* comprehended under that *Genus*. This my Adversary seemeth to Smile at, as Ridiculous; and that from the Confidence he hath in an Exposition of this Scripture, wherein I think he is Singular; and may be more exposed than any Comment given by others: which he superciliously rejecteth: it is this, *Teaching for Doctrines, in the Language of the New Testament, is affirming such a thing to be the Command, or immediate Will of God, when it hath no other Original than Humane Institution; and nothing else but what shall bear some Analogie to that, is the Crime here reproved.* It seems his Confidence was mixed with some Diffidence of this his Comment on the Text: when he thinketh to Ward off a Blow by the uncertain Sound of, *what beareth Analogie to that*: what he will make to *bear Analogie* to calling that God's Command, which is but Mans Device, we cannot tell, unless he shall please, in his next Edition, to inform us. For his Exposition it self, it is no way to be admitted, nor can he prove, by Instances, that this is the Language of the New Testament: I am sure this Place cannot be so understood. For the things that Christ here calleth by that Name are, strict Observance of Washing the Hands when they came from the Mercat-Place, Religious Washing of Pots, Tables, Cups, *&c.* Dotations made to *Corban*, the Church Treasure, with Neglect of Relieving their Necessitous Parents; now that the Jews did ever pretend, or Teach, that these

were the Commands, or immediate Will of God; more than our Ceremonialists Teach their Ceremonies to be such (for both pretend a general Command for obeying the Church) I think he will never be able to prove: all that appeareth that they Taught about these Things (so far as either Scripture, or other History doth inform us) is, that these Things ought to be observed; that it is Sin, and Schism, and therefore Censurable, to neglect them; and that on account of the Churches Authority to impose them. And do not Prelatists Teach the same Doctrines concerning their Ceremonies, and the Holy Days, in particular. He citeth *Hammond. Practi. Catechis. p.* 203. but telleth us not what he saith, for indeed his very Words are borrowed from that Learned Author, in that Place he Citeth; where he seemeth to speak in another Strain, in his Notes on this Scripture, his Words are, *My Commands are not Heeded by them, but their own Constitutions set up in Stead of them*; this is far from Teaching that they were Gods Commands immediatly, *Luc. Brugen. docentes, id est, sequentes ipsi, & alios docentes ut sequantur.* Also, Interpreters generally, and among them *Hammond* himself, look on ἐντάλματα as what is meant by διδασκαλίας, they Taught these Commands; their Doctrine was, that they should be obeyed, and the Things practised; but he giveth us no account of their Teaching that they were Commands immediatly given by God. He hath an incoherent Passage, *p.* 27. *We do not pretend that we have any expres's Institution in the New Testament, for Celebrating the Christian Festivities. We know that they owe their beginning to the Piety and Wisdom of the Apostles, or their Successors.* I gladly would know how he can know that the Apostles gave them a beginning, if they be not instituted in Scripture; unless he will rest in uncertain Traditions, as a part of the Rule of our Faith and Practice, to supply what the Scripture is defective in. Neither shall we demand of him expres's Institution, if he can shew us Institution by good Consequence drawn from Scripture.

§ 16. His strongest Refutation of another Citation, *viz. Jer.* 9. 31. is to call it a *Foolry*. He maketh the Argument to be Foolish enough indeed; as a Wise Man may be exposed as a Fool, by putting on him a Fools Coat, and Hood and Bells; but they are neither Wise, nor Ingenuous Men who Treat him so. He maketh our Argument from that Text, to run thus; *God did not Command the Israelites to burn their Sons and Daughters in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom; Ergo, to appoint a Time for the Solemn and Religious Performance of that Worship, which he himself commanded,*

ded, falleth under the same Censure. This Way of Arguing is none of ours but his own. We thus argue, God condemneth that Worship of the Jews, as on other accounts, so on this; that *he Commanded it not, neither came it into his Mind, Ergo,* no Worship devised by Men, and not instituted by God, is allowable. And we have above proved the Celebration of Holy Days to be, not only a determining of a Circumstance of Worship, which is not determined in Scripture, but must be determined by Men; but to be an Addition to the Command of God, for setting apart some of our Time to his Solemn Service. If this Reason be *Foolrie, Calvin* as well as I, must be *a Declared Fool, (viz.* by the Wisdom and Candor of this Author) who on this Place, hath this Passage, *Hæc ratio diligenter notanda est; quoniam his Deus ansas hominibus præcidit, ubi hoc solo titulo condemnat, quicquid tentabunt Judæi, quia non mandavit ipsis; non est igitur alia quærenda ratio in coarguendis superstitionibus, nisi quod carent præcepto Dei.* And a little below, *Ergo, magnum pondus est in his verbis, ubi dicit Propheta, Deum nihil tale mandasse, & nihil tale sibi venisse in mentem; quasi diceret, nimium sapere homines, cum excogitant quæ ipse nunquam quæsivit, imo nunquam voluit cognoscere.* That the Phrase, *I Commanded them not,* hath in it a *Meiosis,* I shall not controvert, but this *Meiosis* doth not hinder, but that Literally, and in Propriety of Speech, this horrid Fact is condemned, as uncommanded Worship. No doubt, this Fact was not only not commanded, but forbidden, yea greatly abhorred by the Lord; but it doth not thence follow, that it was not Evil, *eo nomine,* because not commanded; seing that Immorality of it is expresly mentioned.

§ 17. Another Scripture for Humane Holy Days had been mentioned in *the Apology, p.* 42. *John* 10. 22, 23. where it is said, that *Christ walked in the Temple at the Feast of Dedication.* Which was none of these that God appointed. It was Answered, *His walking in the Temple on that Day cannot be strained to signifie either Joyning or Approbation:* this Answer he is pleased to represent, *p.* 179. as if it had been, that *Christ went thither only to walk,* which he calleth *an Irreligious Fancy.* This is not fair Dealing: it was neither said nor thought, that *Christ went thither only to walk.* We think he had a higher End, *viz.* To take Occasion to Discourse with the People, or to Preach the Things of Salvation, while they were assembled in the Temple. His Refutation of this (beside what is said) is, *Christ was at the Feast of Dedication, who never separated from the Jewish Worship. Answer,* That he was at the Feast, wanteth Proof; he

was in the Temple on the Feast Day, *Ergo*, he was at the Feast; *id est*, joyned in that Solemnity, *non sequitur*: That *he never separated from the Jewish Worship*; is said without Warrant; we affirm, he did, and give our Reason for what we say, *viz.* he condemned all that Worship, that had not Divine Institution, as is before proved; *Ergo*, he did not joyn in it. I think sober Men will judge this a good Consequence. *Here was* (saith our Author) *the most proper Occasion to reprove Humane Religious Festivities. Answer*, Our Lord knew better what was the fittest Occasions for what he had to do than this Gentleman could Teach him. He had condemned them in general: on this particular Occasion, he had greater Things to Treat with them about, and things, that, being uncontroverted, were not so like to irritate them, and render his Doctrine ineffectual to them. That *he quarrelled nothing in the Jewish Constitution, merely because it was of Humane appointment*; is to fly in the Face of a considerable part of his Doctrine, mentioned *Matth.* 15. *from the beginning*. He is confident to say that *Christ complyed with such Usages*, (*viz.* Ceremonies of Humane Appointment) *among the Jews*. And he bringeth two Instances of it; one is, *Christ kept the Passover, not according to Institution, but according to the Custom that then obtained in the Jewish Church, viz. With having the Loins girt; having Shoes on the Feet, and a Staff in the Hand*: and he asserts, that *there is nothing in the Original Precept, that giveth the least Hint of its being Temporary, and Relative to their Itinerary State in the Wilderness: but rather, that it was of perpetual Force and Obligation, yet the Church changed that Ritual of Divine Institution, into another that signified more propperly Rest, as the other did their Travelling in the Wilderness*. Here is plain Dealing; whereby our Author giveth us yet further to understand his Principles. I shall not call this Parcel of Divinity simply *New*: but I am sure it is *New* among Protestants: nor did I ever meet with any of the Prelatick Party, who carried the Churches Power of instituting Ceremonies to this Height. For if this Reasoning have any Force, it will conclude, that the Church, may not only add to Gods Institutions; but may abolish some of them, and put others, more fit, in their Room; and if so, why should we blame the Church of *Rome*, who, though Christs Appointment was that Bread and Wine should be given to the People in the Lords Supper, yet have thought it fitter that they should only have the Bread, and the Wine should be reserved for the Priest alone; and Kings, and some others, by the Popes Indulgence: and they give as good Reason for what they say, as he doth here

here for his Principle, *viz.* That Receiving both Elements was fit for that State of the Church; but not for her more Multiplied and Numerous Condition, so the Council of *Constance*, *Sess.* 13. *Licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, & suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie, panis & vini, hoc venerabile Sacramentum: tamen, hoc non obstante, sacrorum canonum Authoritas, laudabilis & approbata consuetudo Ecclesiæ, servavit & servat, et licet hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula & scandala est introducta rationaliter, quod licet in Primitiva Ecclesia hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, postea a conficientibus sub utraque, & a Laicis tantummodo sub specie panis recipiatur, &c.* Also the *Council of Trent*, *Sess.* 21. *chap.* 21. Recognoseeth the Councils Power in this; that though Christ did Institute the Sacrament in both kinds, yet they make a Law against it, which cannot be changed but by the Church it self. Let the intelligent Reader judge, whether here be not a harmonie of Principles, in this Matter of the Churches Power, between these two Anti-Christian Councils, and this Author who owneth himself a Protestant; let it be also left to the Judgment of all who regard the Authority of Christ, more than that of Man, whether it be not more rational to say, that seing it is evident, that some Rules about the Passover, which were at first enjoyned to the *Israelites* in the *Wilderness*, were afterward not observed by the Church, and even by Christ himself (who was a strict Observer of the *Mosaical Law* while it stood in Force) were appointed but for that present time, and that the Change that the Church afterward made was from her Knowledge of this Temporarie Institution, and not from any Power that the Church pretended to, to Alter what GOD had Instituted?

§. 18. Another Instance he bringeth of CHRIST'S complying with the Jewish rites not Instituted by the LORD is, *the Jews used a postcœnium, of Bread and Wine, after the Paschal Lamb: This Christ not only complyed with, but he adopted it into his own Religion, and gave it a high Signification, and made it a Fœderal rite of the New Covenant*, &c. here is another piece of his Divinitie, which I confess is not so singular as the former; for some pretenders to be Antiquaries, and great Criticks, have in this, trode the way before him. *Answer*, If we should yield what they here demand, as to Matter of Fact, *viz.* that the Jews used to eat Bread and drink Wine, after eating the Paschal Lamb; and that Christ did the like; will any rational Man say, that this is an Approving of their Adding to the Ceremonies of the Passover. For, 1. Can they prove that

that Christ did this in imitation of that Jewish Custom; or that he had any regard to it: may not we do the same Action that another doth, yet do it on other Designs than imitation of that Person? or, is it imaginable that our Lord would build so great a Gospel Ordinance on such a Foundation, as is the Practice of such an Apostate People as the Jews then were? sure he had a higher Design in this Heavenly Institution. Again, if there was such a Custom then in the Jewish Church; there is no ground to think that it was of any great Antiquitie; or that is was brought in while that Church continued in any measure of Puritie; but it must have had its rise in the time of that Apostace that ushered in their rejecting the Messiah, and their being utterly rejected of God, for so doing; for we read nothing of it before the Captivitie; nor after it while the *Maccabees* lived: Now can any Man think that Christ, who had reproved their Religious Washings, and other Ceremonies, would be so fond of these, which stood on the same bottom with them? I further Answer, that this Tradition of the *Postcænium* is a groundless fancie: I find no such Custom among the Jews, of taking Bread and Wine after the Paschal Supper. *Scaliger* first broached this Opinion of a *Postcænium*, or two parts, or Services in the Paschal Supper. And is reprehended by *Buxtorf* for it, but Defended by *Capell de literis Hebræ*: p. 167. who out of *Maimonides*, giveth a long Account of all the rites used by the Jews in the Celebration of it: *Lightfoot* also, and *Grotius*, give a verie critical Accompt of their Rites out of the same *Rabbi*: *Addison* also, in his *Description of the present State of the Jews in Barbarie*; describeth that Feast, as Celebrated by them: but what our Author allegeth is found in none of them: but on the contrarie; I find two things that they agree in, which maketh against his *Postcænium* of Bread and Wine, and Christ imitating of it: The 1. Is, the Jews used many Benedictions at several Cups, and Morsels they took: so did not our Lord: he Blessed the Meat that they eat, no doubt, and we read of this Blessing Bread and Wine in the LORD'S Supper; but to say that he repeated so many Benedictions (which were no fewer than Eight or Nine; beside several Instructions that that they read out of the Scripture, which Reading they called הַגָּדָה: and other Composers of their own) and all these Benedictions were by a set Form of Words. If my Antagonist will perswade us that our LORD conformed to all these Rites, he must prove it by good Arguments, and not Authoritatively impose on Peoples Credulitie. The 2. Thing that I observe out of the Accompt that these Au-

Authors give of the Passover is, that they begin with a Cup, then they take the quantitie of Olive of the πικρίδες, or *bitter Herbs*, and dip it in Sauce made for that Feast, then they eat what each one listeth, and after some other Observations, they take the quantitie of an *Olive* dipt as before, and after they may eat nothing that Night: here is no concluding with Bread and Wine, for a *Postcænium*. Yea, *Capellus* (who seemeth to be too fond of our Authors Notion, that Christ had regard to the Passover rites in Instituting His Supper) giveth yet a quite other Accompt of it than he doth: for he telleth us, that Christ took Bread and Wine in stead of that Morsel of the bigness of an *Olive*: whence it clearly followeth, that Christ did not appoint Bread and Wine in Imitation of the *Postcænium*, consisting of the same Materials: If he have no better Argument to Prove the *vanity of Presbyterian Speculations* (as he phraseth it) their Opinions will be able to stand against all his Assaults. I adde the Observation of *Buxtorf Synagog: Judaic: cap.* 13. who after a full Accompt of the Jewish Passover, and all the Rites of it, hath these Words, *p.* 307. *ex paucis istis facile perspici potest, Judæos festum paschatis amplius ex Mosis, vel Dei præcepto, sed juxta Rabbinorum suorum Traditiones Celebrare, quas pluris faciunt quam* Dei *Precepta.*

§. 19. His next Work is, to Justifie his high Extoling of the Holy Days: he had said, *it is certain that nothing perserveth the knowledge of the Christian Religion among the Bodie of the People more than the Festivities of the Church*: and this I called *raving*, the Word and Sacraments being more useful for that End. To this he Answereth two things, *p.* 181. 182. The first is, that *he did not Attribute this effect to the Festivities without the Word and Sacraments, to which they are subordinate: as being the fittest seasons for Christian Exercises.* I still think this is no sober Doctrine: for there is a fitter Season for these of Christs appointment, even the Christian Sabbath. Beside, it is evident that he Spake of his Festivities, though not in a separated Notion, yet in a distinct Notion, from the Word and Sacraments; and I not only think that GOD'S Ordinances are more effectual without, than with Mans devices, I mean the Holy days; because having no Institution, they have not the Promise of the Blessing, and are but *vain Worship*; but that GOD'S Ordinances used with the Holy days; if any Efficacie be to be expected from that Conjunction, have a greater Efficacie toward preserving Knowledge among the People, than the Holy days can have; therefore, there is a more Efficacious mean for that end, what ever notion he take the Holy days in. But the Reader

er may know, that this Expreſſion was not the only ground why *raving* was imputed to him; but ſeveral others of that, or a higher ſtrain; which were Examined, but he is pleaſed to Paſs what was ſaid againſt them; with this ſhift, he *is not at leaſure to follow the Vindicator every where, far leſs is he inclined to Examine all theſe Exceptions againſt the Author of the Apologie.* I find him at leaſure for as needleſs Work, as it were to Clear to us theſe, and the like Paſſages, *do we not ſee all Nations agree in this, that publicke Solemnities, and anniverſarie Feſtivities, and Faſts, are neceſſarie to the Beeing and Beautie of Religion,* (this is a ſoaring flight of his fancie) *they preſerve and increaſe our Mortification. They oblige the moſt Stubborn and Impenitent to think of his Soul: and the viſible Practices of the Church Preach Repentance more effectually, and make more laſting Impreſſions, than the looſe and definite Homilies of ſelf conceited Men* (all the Sermons of the Presbyterians, no doubt are here meant) *the Reformation of the Greek Church is hindred by neglecting of Faſting: the Holy days are the Catechiſms of the People*: all the Notes made on the Paſſages for expoſing of them, he paſſeth over in ſilence; the Reaſon is, if ye will believe him, not that he could not Anſwer all; but becauſe he was not at leaſure. A ſecond Anſwer he bringeth is, that *the Feſtivities cannot be conſidered without the Word and Sacraments; and other Exerciſes of Religion*, and this he taketh a great deal of Pains to illuſtrate; as it is uſual in Diſputing for one to ſay moſt when he hath leaſt to ſay; and he calleth it *groſs ignorance* to think otherwiſe. I need not tell him how many of his Partie make more than a Metahyſical Preciſion, either formal, or *objective*, of the Holy day, from the Religious Work of it; while they Celebrate it, without going to Prayers, in idleneſs or that which is worſe, I know this is not the intent of the Church; yet, it is evident that theſe Days are capable of ſuch an abſtracted Conſideration; I mean, in Practice, what ever be in the ſpeculations that Men have about them: All that he ſo laboriouſly ſayeth about the Conjunction of the Holy days with Religious Exerciſe on them, will evaniſh, if we conſider, that our Queſtion is not, whether the Serious and Solemn Exerciſes of Religion be neceſſarie to theſe Great Uſes, and Effects that he ſpeaketh of, for that we are agreed in; that theſe are *neceſſarie to the Beeing and Beautie of Religion: they preſerve and increaſe our Mortification: they aw the moſt Stubborn and Impenitent*, &c. (that is, they are Means adapted to theſe Ends) but that which we Debate is, whether theſe Ends may not be attained as well, by the Serious and Solemn Exerciſes of Religion in the uſe of theſe Means and Ordi-

Ordinances that GOD hath Appointed; or if the Holy days be neceſſarie, or the Religious Exerciſes, as performed on the Holy days, be neceſſarie for that End. This we deny, and we require that they may Prove it. And the Queſtion is not, whether the Holy days, ſeparated from Religious Exerciſes, are abominable; but whether Religious Exerciſe, or the times of GOD'S Appointing it, *to wit*, the Weekly Sabbath's, without the Holy days, be defective? I take Notice of a Learned diſtinction he hath about the Holineſs of theſe Days, *p.* 183. that *they are not Holier than other Days, in themſelves, or becauſe the Sun is in ſuch a part of the Zodiack: but ſuch a time being ſeparated for ſuch an Exerciſe, receives its Denomination from the Authoritie, and Exerciſe it ſelf, by which it is diſtinguiſhed from other Days.* This ſeemeth to be *ſhuffling*, and not the diſtinct plainneſs that ought to be in Diſputation; For 1. Some of his Partizans aſcribed more Holineſs to them than can be in extrinſick Denomination, even *a relative Holineſs by which Religious work on them is more Acceptable than at other times.* So *Hooker*, above Cited. He ſhould have told us, whether he underſtandeth this *relative Holineſs*, or a mere Denominative Holineſs; that they are called Holy, but there is nothing of Holineſs in them, even with reſpect to the Authoritie and Work that they have relation to. He doth indeed tell us; that they are called Holy days by a relative, and extrinſick Denomination, which is a Metaphyſical notion not eaſily intelligible (he Chargeth others with *nonſenſe, and groſs ignorance*, on leſs Ground,) a relative Denomination muſt be a Denomination built on a Relation; which ſuppoſeth a relative Holineſs in theſe Days, which yet he ſeemeth to diſown again. If the Authoritie by which they are Inſtituted, and the Exerciſes performed in them, can communicate a relative Holineſs to them; wherein doth their Holineſs differ from that of the LORD'S Days? It hath no more but a relative Holineſs, reſulting from Divine Authoritie injoyning it, and the Holy Exerciſes that the LORD hath Commanded to be performed in it. The Difference then, muſt be only this, that it hath a relative Holineſs of GOD'S making: theſe a relative Holineſs of Mans making: and ſo Man as well as GOD, ſhall have a Power to Communicate a relative Holineſs to Days, and conſequently to Places, and other Things: and how much of the Popiſh Superſtition, and Power of Conſecration, that will bring in, I know not; neither, I ſuppoſe, was himſelf aware of it. I think it is evident, that the firſt Day of the Week (which we own as the LORD'S Day) hath no intrinſick

Holineſs of it ſelf: the Sun being in ſuch a Degree of any Sign of the *Zodiak* as maketh up the Number of Eight, from where we begin to Count, doth not Communicate any Holineſs to ſuch a Day. Now if he think the Church can give the ſame ſort of Holineſs to theſe Days that the LORD giveth to the Chriſtian Sabbath; he muſt prove that ſuch Power is granted to her; I am ſure ſome of his Party diſown that Notion. What he Objecteth to himſelf from the abuſe of theſe Days is confirmed, and his Anſwers refuted, §. 5. of this *Section*.

§. 20. The *Antiquitie* of the Holy Days he next conſidereth, *p.* 185. He had in his *Apologie*, required that *we ſhould tell when they began to be Obſerved, and without that he will conclude that they were uſed ſince the days of the Apoſtles*; It was told him, *this is Iniquum Poſtulatum; and the Conſequence is naught. Both becauſe of the Defectiveneſs of Hiſtory, and they came in by inſenſible degrees.* Next, it was ſhewed from the *ſilence of Scripture, and of the Hiſtory the firſt Ages*, that *Chriſtmaſs* (for of that was the Queſtion) *was not Obſerved for* 300 *years after Chriſt*; which was Confirmed by *Eaſter being much noticed, but it not*; and this was Confirmed from *Cent. Magd. & Spanhem.* and ancient Hiſtories cited by them: alſo *Spondan* ſpeaketh but faintly for it: all this he thought fit to overlook; only he Examineth the Aſſertion; which he doth falſifie, by Extending it to *all Holy days except Eaſter*. And laboureth to prove out of *Origen*, and ſome others, that *ſome of the Chriſtian Feaſts were mentioned ſooner than* 300 *years after Chriſt*. I am not much concerned whether it be ſo or not, for if they were then uſed, and injoyned by the Church, ſcripture ſilence of them is enough to us; and laying ſo little weight on humane Authority for them, I ſearched no further; but Truſted to them who had made it their Buſineſs to trie it. But now, when I have further conſidered that Matter, I find the proofs that he bringeth for this Antiquitie of *Chriſtmaſs* very Lame; he firſt citeth *Origen, contra Celſ.* mentioning *the Chriſtian Feſtivities*: but he is not pleaſed to point to the Place of that Large Work, where this Paſſage may be found, that it might be Examined. The like Omiſſion in another, about a Word of *Auguſtin*, he agregeth at great length, *p.* 195. though that Sentence be moſt frequently cited: may not one gueſs that *Origen* ſpeaketh of the Weekly Sabbaths, which are not forbidden, *Gal.* 4. 10. as ſome might think them to be, becauſe Sabbath-days are mentioned in a paralel Place. *Col.* 2. 15. alſo of *Eaſter*, that in, and before *Origins* days, was obſerved, and contended about. His other Citation, *Origen* on *Matth. Homil.* 3. I cannot find; though I

lookt

looke over that Homilie. May be he hath used some later Edition which hath been interpolated, as most of the Writings of the Fathers have. His next Author is *Hippolitus*, as he is Cited by *Photius*: all his Proof out *Hippolitus* is, he wrote Homilies in *Sanctam Theophaniam*, and a Conjecture that himself layeth no weight on: It is *NIAC.* is found in *Gruterus* his Ancient Inscription of the Works of *Hippolitus*, the rest of the Line being defaced. The Answer to all this is easie. 1. *Hippolitus* is an obscure Author; I know not what weight is to be laid on his Testimonie, if he had it. 2. *Photius*, who lived in the Ninth *Centurie*, may be rejected, by an Argument *Ad Hominem*; which he maketh use of to invalidate the Credit of the *Scotish Histories*, concerning our Conversion from Heathenism, *p.* 232. 3. *Hippolitus* writing Homilies in *Theophaniam* cannot prove his Point: unless that he can Prove that that Word, from the beginning of Christianitie was not used to signifie the Incarnation, or *GOD manifest in the flesh* (which is the proper Import of it) but only the Anniversarie Day of the Celebrating that Mystery; which was its current Signification when *Photius* wrot. For his *Niac*, it is so wide and groundless, and a strained Conjecture; that few wise Men will be fond of mentioning it: much less of making an Argument of it: he supplieth it (I know not by what Authority) λογος περι της θεοφανιας. He next citeth the *Canons of the Apostles*, the Authority of which we cannot own; unless he give better Evidence that they are *genuine* than others have yet given. For what he sayeth of the *Natalitia Martyrum*; I denie not that in Process of time, they did degenerate into Holy Days, such as he pleadeth for, and becoming so Numerous, they became a Burden to the Church; and were disused, till the Pope restricted the Observation of them to such as he had *Canonized*; but, at first they were nothing but Commemorations of them, made after the ordinarie Service of the Church: and that Age, and some that followed, were so respectful to the Martyrs (for Encouraging People to be Faithful in that Firey Tryal) that they gave the Martyres extraordinarie Priviledges; whence it may be Inferred, that from these Commemorations, to other Holy Days; is no good Consequence. He hath not yet Proved that the Author of *Def. of the Vindication is once mistaken in his Calculation* (though I do not think it impossible that he may so mistake) nor yet that the *Centuriators have not been Accurate in their Search into Antiquitie*. It is no consequence, the First Christians did Commemorate the Martyres, who Succeeded the Apostles; *Ergo*, they

could not forget the Apostles themselves; if they understand such a way of Commemoration; the Reason I have already given.

§ 21. He Inferreth, *p.* 190. that *the Feast of the Nativity was early Observed; because Easter and Pentecost were so.* The Consequence will not hold; and the Reason was given *Def. of Vindic.* p. 28. viz. *many of the Christians were very tenacious of the old Jewish Customs* (*among which was the Observation of Easter and Pentecost*, the Feast of Weeks may be added) *but had not then begun to devise new Holy Days of their own.* He Answereth an Objection that was brought, that *the Day of CHRIST'S Nativity is uncertain, nor can it be Proved that it was December* 25. He Answereth, *there was no need to determine that Question; and all Christians* (he excepteth some Presbyterians) *are agreed that this Determination was not Necessarie; and that Christians in different Nations, make no scruple to comply with the Chronological Accompts of that Countrey where they live, they Commemorate the Mystery; but do not Impose on the belief of People in matter of Fact.* He sayeth, *the Vindicator left this Consideration altogether untouched.* In this he is in the Wrong; and is Guilty of what he blameth another for. There were Arguments brought to Prove that if such a Day was to be Observed yearly, it was needful that we should know what Day in particular it is; all which he hath left untouched. They are, *it was never heard of, that the Birth day of any Person was kept, but on the Day on which the Person was Born.* That *if this Determination be needless, the Church might appoint any Day of the year for this Commemoration, which none ever affirmed.* It was also told him, that *others, particularly* Master Hooker, *pleadeth with more cogencie for Holy Days* (which he mistaketh as if his Abilitie had been compared with *Master Hookers*, whereas no more was intended, but that *Master Hookers* Arguments, which are lookt on as the strongest on his side, are inconsistent with his Notion) while he sayeth, *Eccles. Polic.* lib. 7. 3. 69. *that GOD'S Extraordinarie Works have Sanctified some times, & Advanced them, so that they ought to be with all Men that Honour GOD, more Holy than other times;* and afterward, *as* CHRIST'S *Extraordinarie Presence Sanctifies some Places, so His Extroordinarie Works Sanctifie some times;* from this the Author of *Deff. of Vind.* inferred justly that *the Church in chusing another Day, acteth Arbitrarily, and unwarrantably; and Absurdly; neglecting the Day so Sanctified* It was also told him, that *it is a probable Argument, at least, that the* LORD *would not have a recurrent particular* Day *Observed on account of* CHRIST'S *Birth; seing He hath concealed from us what Day it was that* CHRIST *was Born; especially seing He hath Instituted the observation of the* Day *of Christ's*

Resurrection

Resurrection, viz. *the Weekly Sabbath*; *He hath told that it was the First Day of the Week*; all this my Adversarie hath overlookt, as either not worthy of his Notice, or as easily Answered. I look on his Citation out of *Austine* as not to this Purpose, where he sayeth, *nos & Dominicam diem, & Pascha Cælebramus, & alias dierum celebritates; sed quia intelligimus quo pertineant, non tempora observamus, sed quæ illis Significantur temporibus*, this indeed Proveth that *Augustin* thought that these were not to be Observed for themselves; but for the Mysteries that were Commemorated on them, but it no way evinceth that he thought there was no need of chusing the Days themselves, on which the things Commemorated were Acted; but one Day of the Year might be as fit as another, as the Church should Determine.

§ 22. It is unreasonable to put it on us *to disprove that Christ was born Dec.* 25. as he doth, *p.* 192. For that we cannot do so well as by fixing on some other Day, and proving that to be the Day of the Nativity: which we pretend to be uncertain: it rather is his part to prove, who affirmeth that our Lord was born on that Day. And yet, if it were needful for our Cause, probable Arguments might be brought, which may incline us rather to think, that he was born at another Season of the Year: some of no mean Learning have been at pains to prove that his Nativity was in *September*, or in *October*. But whatever may be the Concernment of our Adversaries, it is no Concernment to us, what was the Day: it is enough to us, that the Mystery it self is firm and sure. The Reader may find this Question about the Day and Moneth of the Nativity, Learnedly handled by our Countrey Man *Master Bailly*, *operis historici, & Chronologici lib.* 2. *quæs.* 7. *p.* 42. *& seq.* where he concludeth, with *Spanhemius*, *Mensem & Diem Natalitium a nemine determinari debere, nec posse, cum de iis Scripturæ silent, nec quicquam certi primis Ecclesiæ Christianæ seculis a quopiam prolatum sit.* He had been charged by the Author *of Def. of Vind.* with *Shuffling*, in that he had pleaded God's Appointment for Holy Days, because *God hath appointed that we should obey the Apostles and their Successors, as our lawful Ecclesiastical Rulers*: because though we are to obey the Apostles, whom we know to have been Infallibly Guided; we are not to obey their Successors (real or pretended) further than they bring Divine Warrant; which cannot be shewed for Holy Days. He endeavoureth to clear himself from *Shuffling*, by telling us that *there was no more meant than that the Church, may, by that Power which is perpetually lodged in her, Regulate the Publick Solemnities of Worship; and when she enjoyneth nothing but what is lawful, we ought to obey.* Here is

Shuffling

Shuffling to Excuse his former *Shuffling*; he is entangled by Wrestling to Extricat himself. For he supposeth the whole Question, that there is a Power perpetually lodged in the Church, to appoint Holy Days; otherwise he saith nothing to the purpose. Again, he supposeth that appointing of Holy Days, is as much in the Churches Power, as other Regulating of Publick Solemnities; whereas he should have considered, if he would have Explained, and not Confounded and Darkened the Matter, that there is a Regulating of Publick Solemnities, which lyeth in determining Circumstances, which must be determined, and yet are not determined in Scripture, such as the Time, Place, and Order of these Religious Actions, that the Lord hath appointed his Day to be spent in: there is another Regulating, which is adding to what the Lord hath appointed; more Days to his Day, new Religious Ceremonies to these which are of Divine Institution; or determining Circumstances, which neither are determined by God, nor need to be determined; such as are more Holy Days than Christ hath appointed; the Churches Power about the first sort we do not controvert: her Power about the second is the Subject of our Question: and here he either supposeth the Question, *viz.* That the Church had such Power; or he saith nothing to the purpose. Yet further, when he speaketh indistinctly of Apostolick Power, and that of their Successors, as to this Regulation; if he mean no more than such Regulation as is always in the Churches Power, he giveth the Successors of the Apostles the same Regulating Power that themselves had; the Consequence of which is, that their Successors (I suppose he meaneth the Bishops) may institute new Offices, new Government, new Discipline, and all other Ordinances in the Church, as the Apostles might: which is full as high as the Papists Screw up the Power of the Church, and is indeed, to make the Bishops absolute *Lords over God's Inheritance*. And this he confirmeth by telling us, that *the Apostles made Constitutions that were laid aside by their Successors; and other Usages came in their Room*, but because he saw this lyable to Exception he distinguisheth betwixt *greater Usages, that are variable unless they are equally subservient to the great Ends of Discipline, in all Ages and Countries; & nisi consuetudine Ecclesiæ universæ sint roboratæ: and lesser Usages, whose Continuance and Abrogation may depend on the Convenience of particular Churches*; and he giveth an Instance in the *Deaconesses*, which he saith *are not in the Presbyterian Meetings, nor any Reformed Churches*. If he would have Extricated himself from the *Shuffling* that was imputed

imputed to him, he ſhould have given us ſome Rules, or Characters, by which we might diſcern, what Conſtitutions of the Apoſtles are to be accounted Great, and Unalterable; and what Small, and Changeable by their Succeſſors: if Marches be not clearly Rid here, we are at a Woful Uncertainty: yea, bold Men may dare to meddle with Epiſcopacy it ſelf: and pretend that it is one of *the leſſer Apoſtolical Conſtitutions*; if they did at all appoint it. The Marks that he hath given us are very inſufficient, their *univerſal Subſervience to the Ends of Diſcipline* will be as much controverted, as whither they be great Conſtitutions or not: he ſaith Biſhops and Holy Days are ſuch; we deny it; and will Debate it with him; and ſo we are ſtill in the Dark, what Apoſtolick Conſtitutions may be laid aſide, or muſt be retained; for his *conſuetudo univerſæ Eccleſiæ*, firſt that dependeth on uncertain Hiſtory to know it. Next it is to ſet the univerſal Church above the Apoſtles; or to make her infallible, not only in Fundamentals; but even on Government and Ceremonies. The Inſtance he bringeth proveth nothing; if he can prove that *Diaconeſſes* were an Apoſtolick Conſtitution, I ſhall acknowledge the Presbyterian Churches to be Defective through the want of them.

§ 23. He Vindicateth himſelf, *p.* 194. from Pleading for *blind Obedience*, by telling us, that *he only Pleadeth for Obedience in lawful Things, not for Obedience in Things Arbitrarily Impoſed, as the Papiſts.* If he prove the Obſervation of Holy Days to be lawful in it ſelf, and that the Church hath Power to inſtitute them; I ſhall crave him Pardon for what was ſaid of *blind Obedience*: but while he bringeth the Authority of the Church for the Ground on which we ſhould obey in this Matter, and maketh it a ſufficient Argument why they ſhould be obſerved, that the Church Commandeth it: I muſt ſtill think that this is either to Plead for *blind Obedience*, or Egregiouſly to Trifle. He hath next, a long Diſcourſe about a Citation out of *Auguſtine*: of which before. In *the Def. of Vind. p.* 30. it had been ſaid, that *it is not a Day being Anniverſary that we ſcruple, but that it is ſeparated from Civil Uſe by Mens Authority, and Dedicated to Religion in an Anniverſary Courſe.* This he Treateth in Ridicule, not (I ſuppoſe) becauſe he cannot, but becauſe he will not underſtand it. We neither Scruple becauſe the Day is Anniverſary; a Day for Civil Solemnity, appointed by men, may be ſuch: nor becauſe it is ſet apart for Religious Uſe; an Occaſional Day for Solemn Humiliation, when God by a ſpecial Providence calleth for the Work, and Man determineth the Day, is lawful, as is the perpetual recurrent Lords Day,

Day, appointed by God; nor thirdly, do we quarrel these Days, merely because they want a special Divine Warrant; because Anniversary Days for Civil Use, might be appointed by Men. But the Ground of our Scruple is, the Complex Nature of these Days; that they are wholly separated from Civil Use, as the Lords Day is; that they are perpetually Discriminated from other Days in the Year; and that they are perpetually Dedicated to Religion, and all this, not by Divine, but by Humane Authority. If there be any *Raving*, or any thing unintelligible in this, I shall be content to be Instructed by him; or any who is of his Opinion. Are there not many Actions that are Good and Lawful; considered under several Circumstances; which if ye consider all their Circumstances Complexly, are Unlawful; for Instance, the Magistrat may appoint his Subjects to meet in Arms; he may also appoint that this Meeting be Yearly, Monethly, or Weekly, if need be; yea he may appoint this Meeting to be on the Lords Day, in Case of Necessity; yet he cannot lawfully appoint that they should, without Necessity, meet every Year, every Moneth, or every Week, on the Sabbath Day. He complaineth that it is called *Thrasonick Triumph*, when he telleth us of *Danger and Impiety in separating from the Church, in these excellent Constitutions that are received from the beginning, and in all Countries where the Name of Jesus hath been Worshiped: such Constitutions and Solemnities have been derived from the Apostles, or Apostolick times*: These are his Words; though in his Review of them here, he seemeth to Smooth them a little. He will have it only to be *Thrasonick Boasting*, when a Man admireth his own Wit or Performances. I love not to contend about Words; nor need I to *write a Dictionary* on this Occasion: nor shall I judge what Opinion he hath of himself; but I leave it to the Reader to judge, whither it may not be so Termed, when one Insulteth over his Adversary, as having great and evident Advantage against him, when yet there is no Cause for so thinking; and whither he be not guilty of this Boasting, (or whatever he will call it) while he insinuateth the Universality, the Antiquity, and the Apostolick Authority of the Holy Days, and that with charging his Adversarieswith *dangerous Impiety*, on account of their differing from them; while all these are the things that he and I do controvert about.

§ 24. *He* taketh it ill that it was called *a loose Reasoning*, when he telleth us that *the Knowledge of Christ doth not extinguish the Light of Reason; therefore such Constitutions (as the Reason of Mankind is agreed in) have nothing*

nothing in them contrary to the Purity of our Religion. This was called *loose Arguing*, becauſe he taketh an Unconteſted Truth for his firſt Propoſition; and the Concluſion that we Debate about is ſuppoſed, in place of the ſecond Propoſition. His Defence is; *No Society of Mankind ever thought Anniverſary Holy Days unlawful; but all of them thought them proper Means to Excite Religion*: he telleth us that *Clamours againſt them* (ſo he termeth our Reaſons) *deſtroy all Unity and Order, about things not only Innocent, but Uſeful in their own Nature and Tendency*: here is yet more *looſe Arguing*, while he ſuppoſeth ſtill the thing in Queſtion. We deny their Innocency, alſo their uſefulneſs; and muſt do ſo, till we ſee better Arguments for what is aſſerted: the Apoſtolick Churches did not uſe them; whence we may with Confidence conclude, that they did not think them proper Means to *Excite Devotion*; yea, it is no weak Conſequence, if we infer, that they thought them unlawful; being none of theſe things which Chriſt had Commanded, nor his Apoſtles Taught. That *they were not forbidden*, is Anſwered above; they are forbidden in general, and that is enough. That Reaſoning againſt Holy Days of Humane Appointment *deſtroyeth all Unity and Order, &c.* looketh more like *Clamour* than any thing that we have ſaid; there was Unity and Order in the Apoſtolick Church, without them; and ſo is there in the Presbyterian Societies. His Syllogiſm that he preſenteth us with, *p.* 201. doth not Retrieve the Looſeneſs of his former Reaſonings: it is, *whatever is agreeable to true Reaſon, is rather improved than condemned by Religion; but ſuch Conſtitutions* (he muſt mean the Holy Days) *are agreeable to true Reaſon; Ergo, there is nothing in them contrary to the Purity of our Religion.* I take no notice of the Form of this Syllogiſm (of the Rightneſs of which he is confident) it may eaſily be reduced to Form, by a little Change of the Concluſion; here is indeed cloſs Reaſoning; but it is not concludent Reaſoning: for we deny the Minor: though he attempteth its Proof, both in proſecuting the firſt, and the ſecond Propoſition. I am not fond of his Method of Probation; he concludeth it after the Form of a *Sorites*; whereas there is nothing like it in his Progreſs: but that is a ſmall Matter: I except againſt his Proof in what is more material; that *all Nations are agreed in this; and this is the beſt Evidence of what is agreeable to true Reaſon*: I deny both theſe Propoſitions, 1. How will he prove that all Nations were agreed about the Neceſſity and Uſefulneſs of Holy Days? Or, I diſtinguiſh this Propoſition; all Nations are agreed in general, that there ſhould be ſome Religious Ho-

ly Days: if I ſhould put him to the Proof of this, it might puzzle him; but for our part, we think it of great Uſe, and neceſſary alſo, *neceſſitate præcepti*; whatever may be ſaid of the *neceſſitas medii*; we think it a Wiſe and Excellent Conſtitution of the Divine Will, that we have recurrent Days, (I mean the Chriſtian Sabbath) and Occaſional Times of Solemn Worſhipping God: but that all Nations are agreed about the Neceſſity of Holy, Religious Anniverſary Days of Mans Appointing; this is yet unproved; the Jewiſh Holy Days, (till that Church fell into manifold Apoſtacy) were appointed by God; the Heatheniſh Religious Rites, (and their Holy Days among the reſt) were appointed (as they pretended) by theſe whom they owned for gods; which I could prove, if it were not to digreſs; with that Pretenſion *Numa*, and others gained the People to ſubmit to their Religious Rites. For his ſecond Propoſition; it is utterly falſe, that the Agreement of Nations is the beſt Evidence of what is according to right Reaſon: this might hold, if Men were generally Perfect in Knowledge, and Holineſs; if their Mind, Will, and Affections had no way been hurt by the Fall; but in the preſent State of Fallen, Corrupt, and Sinful Men; it is a Falſe, Dangerous, yea Pernicious Poſition: if underſtood (as here it muſt be) of Matters of revealed Religion; ſuch as inſtituted Worſhip is. His Proof of this Aſſertion is moſt abſurd; which is, two Maxims of the Civil Law, wofully miſunderſtood; and miſapplyed, *viz. Quod major pars Curiæ efficit, pro eo habetur, ac ſi omnes egerint*; and, *Refertur ad univerſos quod publice fit per majorem partem.* This is to be underſtood, of Humane Courts in any Nation, or Society; not of the Conſent of all Nations: otherwiſe one Nation could not make Laws for it ſelf; but muſt peruſe the Volumns of all Nations, that they may know what Laws obtain in moſt Nations. Again, which is yet more to our purpoſe, theſe Maxims hold in Civil, not Religious Matters: to make the Conſent of Nations to be the Rule of Religion, (as this Author manifeſtly doth) hath ſo many Abſurdities wrapt up in it, that it is a wonder that ſuch a Fancy could fall into the Head of one who owneth *revealed* Religion; and is not far from *Hobbiſm*, or *Deiſm*, with which he is not ſparing to charge the Presbyterians, on far leſs Cauſe given. I am far from charging him with theſe horrid Opinions: but I adviſe him to beware of Zeal for Humane Holy Doly Days on ſuch Principles as would lead Men into that Snare. If we muſt be determined by a Pole among Mankind (as his Aſſertion doth plainly import) in the Matters of our Religion;

Heatheniſm

Heatheniſm will clearly carry it againſt Chriſtianity. Yea, Turkiſm will bid fair for it: and Popery will clearly Outvote Proteſtantiſm. This is a thouſand times worſe than what he (or his Friend) is ſo angry with a Presbyterian Parliament for, having regard *to the Inclinations of the People*, in ſettling Presbyterial Government; we muſt now receive the Holy Days, becauſe the Inclinations of the Apoſtate World, Heathens, Jews, Papiſts, *&c.* incline that Way. His diſtinguiſhing of ſuch Conſtitutions, by *conſidering their general, or abſtracted Nature, and conſidering them with their Ends and Objects*; will not help him; for corrupt Men will always be generally for what is worſt, conſider it as ye will; neither can it be ſaid, that this Rule of Judging of Religion holdeth not in the Eſſentials, and great Points; but in the inferior Matters, and Rituals: for, the inſtituted part of Religion lieth more remote from Mans Reaſon, as a Contriver of it, than other things in Religion do: becauſe theſe depend merely on Inſtitution, and the Will of the Inſtituter; as ye can leſs give a Reaſon, why Bread and Wine ſhould ſignifie the Body and Bloud of Chriſt, (except from the Will of him who appointed this) than ye can do why we ſhould Pray to God, obey him, *&c.*

§ 25. He taketh it very ill, and calleth it *ſtrong Natural Monſenſe*, that the Holy Days (and other Religious Ceremonies of Mans Deviſing) *are called new Means of Grace, which are not to be appointed by Mens Reaſon; but by Gods Authority*, He ſaith *they are only appointed to increaſe our Devotion for the old Means of Grace; they are but Circumſtances of time determinable by the Church.* All that is ſufficiently refuted already: but he repeateth, and forceth me to do ſo; *Firſt*, That which is appointed *to increaſe our Devotion* toward Prayer, the Word and Sacraments, (which are the old Means of Grace) is a Mean of Grace it ſelf; for *increaſe of Devotion* is Grace; therefore, the Means toward that End muſt be Means of Grace: and if theſe be appointed by the Lord, as the Sabbath is, for increaſe of our Devotion in Prayer, *&c.* this is one of theſe he calleth the *old Means of Grace, viz.* Means of Gods appointing; if appointed by Men; for the ſame end, they muſt be *new Means of Grace* appointed by Men; and ſuperadded to theſe of Gods Appointment. But the Holy Days are ſuch, *ex tuo ore*; being appointed to *increaſe our Devotion*, this cannot be ſaid of mere determining a Circumſtance of Worſhip; as appointing a Week Day Sermon. 2. That which is neceſſary to *the Beeing and Beauty of Religion: to keep us in mind of the Myſteries of our Religion, is the Peoples Catechiſm, &c.* muſt be a *Mean of Grace*; but all this, and more, he

hath aſcribed to the Holy Days; not only to the Work to be done on them, but to it as done on ſuch a Day; they muſt then be *new Means of Grace*, beſide what God hath inſtituted. 3. That they are but Determinations of the Time of Worſhip, is above refuted; and himſelf refuteth it, by affirming that they are appointed for *increaſing our Devotion*. I ſhould allow him not only to *Smile*, but to burſt out into Laughter, if it had been ſaid (as he pretendeth) that Chriſtmaſs was kept in Honour of *Julius Cæſar*, before Chriſt was born; he need never want Matter of Laughter, if he be allowed thus to Deviſe what may make him Merry. All that was ſaid is, that Holy Day was ſo kept; and thence called *Yule* in *Scotland*. The Import of which is no more but this; that the ſame Day being kept by the Heathens on one Account, ſome Chriſtians changed it into another Uſe, and Celebrated it as the Day of Chriſts Nativity; as I could ſhew they did with many other, both Times and Places. His Criticiſing on the Word *Yule*, making it *Noel*, and then turning it to a *nouvelle*; and Expounding it, *a Day of Tidings*, I might rather *Smile* at; I think it not worthy a Laborious Examination. I need not take it very ill that he uſeth me with Contempt and Scorn, when he, *p.* 208. putteth the Excellent *Buchannan* among the *higheſt Order of Devils*. It was ſaid that our Author ſaith as much as that the Holy Days are *the Power of God to Salvation*. He Anſwered, *p.* 209. he *looketh on them as the Publick and Stated Seaſons wherein the Power of God to Salvation is manifeſted*. This is far below what he had before ſaid; that *they are neceſſary to the Beeing of Religion, &c.* and this Expreſſion he Apologizeth for, *ibid.* blaming his Antagoniſts *ill Nature*, becauſe he underſtood it not of *the External Profeſſion of Religion; and that it was meant that they are very uſeful for it, as the Exerciſes of Religion muſt be performed, ſometimes with Order, Uniformity, and Society*. I confeſs neither is my Nature ſo good as to applaud this Anſwer, nor is my Underſtanding ſo good as to comprehend how this can be the Meaning of that Aſſertion. Would he have us ſo good Natured as to think all is ſound that he ſaith, whither it can be reconciled to any ſound Senſe, or not? I am ſure he doth not ſet us a Copy of ſuch good Nature. We have the Mercat fallen very low; from the Holy Days being *neceſſary to the Beauty, and Beeing of Religion*: firſt, to this, that *inward Religion may do well enough without them*; next, *that they are not neceſſary, but only very uſeful to the External Profeſſion of Religion*. And then, that *External Religion needeth them only ſometimes*. Further, that it may ſubſiſt always without them: but it will not, in that Caſe,

Case, be so *Orderly* as were needful. Yet again, it is but for the *Uniformity* of External Religion, that they are any way useful, so as the *Beeing and Beauty* of it may be kept where they are not observed: only these Churches are not like their Neighbours. And lastly, Religion, Internal and External, may have both its Beeing and Beauty, in particular Persons, though they observe no Holy Days; only it is useful, that if they think fit to go to Church, and to Worship God, *in Society*, on these Days, that they should observe them. If he will allow us thus to understand all his big Words, it will tend much to Compromise our Differences. He taketh it amiss, that it was said, that he *Damned them all to Hell who do not observe Christmass*; and this he disowneth. The Ground of that Inference was (for it was not charged on him, further than that it followeth from his Principles) that he maketh the Observation of it *necessary to the beeing of Religion*. I think they who are without the *Beeing of* Religion, are in the Way to Hell; yea though they understand it of *External* Religion, which they are capable to Practise; what can we think of the State of Presbyterians, who do not, yea will not; and think they ought not observe the Holy Days, if the Observation of them be *necessary to the Beeing of Religion*? It is not imaginable that a Person of such Sentiments, can have any Degree of Charity to them, with respect to their Salvation, unless he think a Man may be Saved without all *External Religion*.

SECTION X.

Of Schism.

THe *Enquirer* falleth next upon the Presbyterian notion of *Schism*, as one of *the New Opinions*; the Opinion of the Presbyterians in this, he taketh from one Person, who never pretended to Write in the Name of all the Presbyterians; neither did ever Write of *Schism*, of set Purpose, or fully; but only endeavoured to take off that odious Charge that his Party had laid on Us, by Answering their Arguments: However, I am willing to Account for what he Opposeth in that Author, or to yield to the Force of Argument, if there be any thing which cannot be Defended. My Antagonist hath treated on this Subject so indistinctly, that there is a Necessity to give a more clear Account of the Nature of *Schism* in general; without which we may wrangle, but not

Dispute

Dispute. It hath been an ancient Practice, and is frequent in later Times, and in ours; for different Parties to brand one another (and that with fierey Zeal) with the odious Name of *Schismaticks*; without considering, or at least Defineing what it is that they call *Schism*; The bitter Epithets among the Ancients given to them whom they imputed this Blame to, did sufficiently shew their Zeal against *Schism*, but did more shew that there were *Schisms* among them; and that they were Angry one with another, and hold furth some particular Causes of these Heats; than lead us to a distinct Knowledge of the general Nature of *Schism*: Some modern Authors have Written more distinctly of it; yet the particular Cause they were concerned for, hath distorted their Thoughts of the Nature of *Schism* into one side; and wrested its Essence to serve their *Hypothesis*. It is Observed by the Learned and Reverend *Stillingfleet*, *Irenic. p.* 108. that *the word Schism (though it sound harsh, it being often taken in an ill sense) as it importeth a separation from a Church, is not a thing intrinsically evil in it self; but is capable of the Differences of Good and Evil, according to the Ground, Reasons, Ends, and Circumstances inducing to such a Separation; the withdrawing from a Society is but the Materialitie of Schism; the Formalitie of it must be fetcht from the Grounds on which that is built.* He citeth also another Author, Observing that *Heresie and Schism as they are commonly used, are Two Theological Scarcrows, with which they who would uphold a Partie in Religion, use to fright away such, as making Enquirie into it, are readie to relinquish and oppose it, if it appear either Erroneous or Suspicious.*

§. 2. Before I come to search into the Opinion of the Fathers, and others, about the Nature of *Schism*; it is needful to premise a few things: 1. *Schism* is a Breach of Unitie; and therefore, there can be no *Schism* where there ought to be no *Unitie*; yea, where there need be no *Unitie*, or where there can be no *Unitie*. Wherefore that we may understand what *Schism* is, it is needful to Consider what *Unitie* should, and must be amongh Churches, and among Christians. There are several sorts of *Unitie*, that we cannot have with all Churches, as local Communion: some that we need not have, as Identitie of Rites: some that we ought not to have with some Churches; as Communion in false Doctrine, or impure Worship. 2. The *Unitie* of the Church may be Considered in all the Notions in which the Church is considered; or in all the sorts of Churches: In the Catholick Church, visible, and invisible, in all the Combinations of Churches among themselves, National, provincial,

vincial, classical, and in particular Comgregatious. It is an undue Notion of *Unitie* and *Schism* that *Independents* have, that they are only to be Considered as in a particular Congregation. 3. *Unitie* consisteth in Joyning with, and cleaving to the Church in all these Acts of Communions with her that the LORD hath made our Dutie: so that it is not only *Schism* to depart from a Church (without just cause) that we have been joyned to; but not to joyn with some Societie of Christians, when it is possible for us; and when we can do it without Sin; the former may be called a Positive, this a negative *Separation*. 4. *Schism* may be also called Positive, or negative in another Sense; the former, when a Partie in a Church, doth not joyn with the Church; yet setteth up no Church in a separated way from that Church, whereof they were Members: the later, when they set up such a distinct Societie; there may be just Causes for both: The *first*, When I cannot joyn with the Congregation I belong to, because of some Corruption that I must partake of, if I joyn; but I partake with some other more pure Societie; The *second*, When a Body of People cannot joyn without Sin, nor can they have the occasion of a Societie, where they might joyn; they must either live without Ordinances, or set up another Religious Societie; on this Ground *Protestants* did thus separate from the *Popish* Churches. 5. There may be a partial *Separation*, when one Ordinance is so corrupted, that we cannot joyn in it, and yet can joyn with the Church in all other Acts of Communion: and a total *Separation*, when either the Church will not suffer us to joyn with her in any part of her Service, unless we joyn in all; or she is so Corrupt that we can joyn with her in nothing that is Religous. The former by most wise and sober Men, is not reckoned such a *Schism*; as that any are to be blamed as *Schismaticks* on that account; but the Author I now Debate with, aggravateth that even to a very high degree of *Schism*; as also do many of his Partizans; driving many Consciencious and good Men from them, for the sake of some Usages, which themselves count indifferent, and the others apprehend to be unlawful. 6. The Differences in Opinion about Religious matters, especially when Managed with heat, and animosities, may be called *Schism*, according to the import of the Word; yet in the usual Ecclesiastical notion of *Schism*, they are not to be so reputed; unless some kind of *separation*, or shuning the ordinarie Church Communion one with another, follow upon them. Diversitie of Opinion, and of Affection, are sinful evils; but it is diversitie of Religious Practice,

Practice, following on these, that maketh *Church-Schism*. 7. When a *separation* falleth out in a Church, the Guilt of it doth certainly ly on the one side or the other; and often neither side is wholly innocent; they who have cause to *separate*, may manage their Good cause by evil Methods, and in a way that is not wholly Commendable: now to know on which side the blame of the *Schism* lieth, we must not always conclude that they are in the fault. 1. Who are the fewer Number; otherwise most Reformations of the Church were sinful: Nor, 2. Who *separate* from the Church Rulers, themselves being in Possession of Church Authority: for this should condemn our Reformation from *Poperie*; Nor, 3. Who *separate* from that Partie that hath the countenance of civil Authority, and hath the Law on its side; not only because it is the Gospel, not the Law of the Land, that is the Rule of our Religion, and Church Practice: but also because that is variable, and by that Rule, they who were the sound Partie one year, may be *Schismaticks* the other; without any Change in their Principles or Practice; which is absurd. Wherefore the blame of *Schism*, in that case, lieth only on them who hath the wrong side of that controverted Matter about which they divide; or who, though their Opinion be better than that of the opposite Partie, yet depart from the Communion of their Brethren without sufficient Cause; every thing that we may justly blame, not being sufficient for making a Rent in the Church. Hence it plainly followeth, that Mens assuming to themselves the name of the Church, is not sufficient Ground for them to Brand such as *Schismaticks* who depart from their Communion: Where Truth and Gospel Puritie is, there is the Church, and they who have most of these are the soundest Church.

§. 3. Having laid this Foundation for Discerning what is truly *Schism*, and where the Blame of it lieth: I shall next enquire into the Opinion of the ancient Church, about *Schism*: it is evident that they did Oppose it; and set forth its Sinfulness, and sad Consequences, with a great deal of Zeal, and that justly; for it is not only a sinful thing on the one side, or the other, but is a great Plague and Judgment from the LORD on a Church, and tendeth to the of Ruine of Good Order, of the inward and outward Practice of Religion, and of Mens Souls; and herein I shall make no Debate with my Antagonist in what he Discourseth, *p.* 211. 212. He is in a vast Mistake, if he reckon it among *the New Opinions* of Presbyterians, that they think well of *Schism*, that is truely such;

or

or speak diminutively of the Evil and Hazard, and Fatal Effects of it; nay, our Principle is, that a Man should part with what is dearest to him in the World, to Redeem the Peace and Unitie of the Church; yea, that nothing can Warrant, or Excuse it, but the Necessity of shuning Sin. It is also evident that the Ancients were very Liberal in bestowing on one another the odious Names of *Schismaticks*, as also of *Heretick*; and that often proceeded from a true (though mistaken) Zeal for lovely Truth, and beautiful Unity: at other times it might arise from some sinful Infirmities, that they (as all Men are) were Subject to. Good Men may be Zealous for their own Opinions, because they take them to be the Truths of GOD. The Fathers called several Practices *Schism*, and shewed a great dislike of them all. As, 1. They blamed Dividing from the Universal Church, as *Schism*; and there are many things wherein Men may be blamed, under this Head, which I shall not now mention; it being my Work at present, only to Enquire into the Opinion of the Fathers in this Matter. I find they were not of my Adversaries Opinion in this; many things he maketh a heavy out-cry about, and blameth People for, as *Schismaticks*, and *Sectaries*, which they laid no such stress on; They bare with one another, though they Differed in Rites, and several Customs. They did not fall out about what they counted indifferent, but maintained Peace, and Concord, notwithstanding of different Practices in one Church from another. *Euseb. lib.* 5. *C.* 23. citeth *Irenæus*, reproving *Victor* of *Rome* (where Usurpation, and imposing on others early began) for Excommunicating other Churches which kept not *Easter* on the same Day with him; and he setteth before him some Differences between *Polycarpus* and *Annicetus*; so as neither could perswade the other to be of his Mind; and yet they did lovingly Communicate together: The Words of *Iren.* as *Eusebius* hath them, are οἱ μὲν γὰρ οἰόνται μιαν ἡμέραν δεῖν αὐτὸς, &c. *Some think they should Fast one Day* (to wit, before Easter) *some two, others* 40 *hours*; but yet *still they retained Peace; the Diversity of their Fasting Commended the Unity of their Faith*: and in the same place εἰρηνεύνον, *they maintained Peace, and none was cast out for that Difference.* Among *Cyprians* Epistles, one from *Firmilian*, sheweth the same thing, *in plurimis provinciis multa pro locorum & nominum varietate diversa fiunt, nec tamen ob hæc ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ pace atque unitate aliquando discessum est.*

§. 4. It is also very plain, that the Fathers, (I mean of the first Ages) did not place the Unitie of the Church Catholick in being of the same

Opinion about all points of Doctrine; but did bear with one another, and maintained Peace, even when they Differed about some of the lesser Truths; yea, when some of them would impose their Opinions on others, and Censure them who Differed from them; they were, by the rest, dealt with, not as Maintainers, but Disturbers of the Peace and Unitie of the Church. *Justin. Martyr: dialog. cum Tryphon:* speaking of these Jewish Converts who clave to the *Mosaical* rites; if they did it out of weakness, and did not impose on other Christians, sayeth of them, προσλαμβανεσθαι καὶ κοινώνειν ἁπάντων ὡς ὁμοσπλάγγνοις ἀδέλφοις δεῖν. That *we must receive them, and Communicate with them, as of the same Mind, or Affections, with us, and as Brethren.* And we find that in the Difference between *Stephen* Bishop of *Rome*, and *Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, about the Validitie of Baptism Administred by Hereticks, *Stephen* was by the rest of the Bishops condemned, as a Breaker of the Peace of the Church; because he Anathematized *Cyprian* on this account. *Firmilian* in the Ep. above-cited, hath these Words on this occasion, *quod nunc Stephanus ausus est facere, rumpens adversum vos pacem quam semper antecessores ejus vobiscum amore & honore servabant. Irenæ. lib.* 4. *C.* 62. Condemneth them as makers of *Schism*, who used such Crueltie toward their Bretheren; *propter modicas & quaslibet causas magnum & gloriosum corpus Christi conscindunt, & dividunt, & quantum in ipsis est, interficiunt; pacem loquentes, & bellum operantes, vere liquantes culicem & camelum transglutientes.*

§. 5. But we find the ancient Fathers with a Holy Zeal, Charging such as Apostats from the Church, and breakers of her Peace, who held Opinions contrarie to the Essential, and Fundamental, or any of the great Articles of the Christian Faith; so that they placed the Unitie of the Catholick Church, in a Harmonious consent to these great Truths. *Irenæ. lib.* 1. *C.* 3. *p.* 53. *edit. Colon* 1625. having given a short Account of the chief Articles of the true Religion, hath these Words, *hanc igitur prædicationem, & hanc fidem adepta Ecclesia, quamvis dispersa in universo mundo, diligenter conservat, ac si in una eademque domo habitaret, ac similiter iis fidem habet, ac si unam animam unumque & idem cor haberet; atque uno consensu hoc prædicat, docet ac tradit, ac si uno ore prædita esset. Quamvis enim dissimilia sunt in mundo genera linguarum, una tamen & eadem est vis traditionis; nec quæ constitutæ sunt in Germania Ecclesiæ aliter credunt; nec quæ in Hispania, neque in Galliis; neque in Oriente, neque in Ægypto, neque in Lybia, aut in medio Orbis terrarum fundatæ sunt, sed quemadmodum Sol*

Creatura

Creatura Dei unus & idem eſt in univerſo Mundo; ita & prædicatio veritatis ubique lucet, & illuminat eos qui ad notionem veritatis venire volunt. Euſſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 4. c. 27. Citeth *Irenæ*, condemning *Tatianum*, the Author of the Sect of the *Encratitæ*, and ſaying of him, ἀπόστας τῆς ἐκκλησίας; he reckoned his Opinions *a falling from the Church*, or a breaking her Unitie. The ſame Hiſtorian, *lib. 4. c. 24.* giveth Account of *Egeſippus* narrating, how long *the Church remained a Virgin, Teaching and Believing nothing but the Law and the Prophets, and what the LORD himſelf taught*, and he mentioneth particularly the Churches of *Corinth*, *Rome*, and *Jeruſalem*; and then ſheweth how *Hereſies* aroſe, whoſe Authors he calleth *falſe Chriſts, falſe Prophets*, and *falſe Apoſtles*, and of them he ſayeth, ἐμέρισαν τὴν ἑνότητα τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *they divided the Unity of the Church, by their corrupt Doctrines againſt GOD, and againſt his CHRIST.* Several other Citations might be brought to this purpoſe; but theſe may be ſufficient. I do not Queſtion, but that there might be other things which might be called *Schiſm*, even with reſpect to the univerſal Church, as if any ſhould bring in Idolatrous, or Superſtitious Worſhip, contrarie to the Rules of the Goſpel; or ſhould violate any of the neceſſarie and laudable Canons of general Councils, and ſhould ſet up Societies in oppoſition, not only to one or few, but to all the Societies of Chriſtians, or all the Soundeſt of them; But of the *firſt*, we hear little of the firſt Ages; neither could the *ſecond* be, becauſe they had no general Councils; nor had the Church then begun to make ſo many Canons as afterward: for the *Third*, we find none guiltie of that except ſome *Hereticks*, who were Noted for their *Hereſie*; and their *Schiſm* little ſpoken of, as being the Conſequent of the other, ſo it was with the *Novatian Schiſm.*

§. 6. There is another ſort of Unity much regarded among the Ancients, which though the Breach of it had as bad influence on all, or moſt Churches, and ſo on the Catholick Church: yet it properly reſpected Neighbour Churches; either, which were united by the Bond of one Government, a Provincial, or leſſer Synod, being made up of them: or only living in the vicinitie of one another, or having frequent occaſion of Correſpondence; they who were not under any uniting Bonds, but theſe commune to all the parts of the Catholick Church, yet had an Unity of kind Correſpondence, mutual Aſſiſtance, as occaſion offered; acquainting one another with their Affairs, ſo far as it was of any Advantage: admitting the Members of other Churches to Communion

with them, on occasion; refusing Communion with such Members of other Churches, as were by them Excommunicated: and this Unity was then broken when these Acts of Friendship were shunned, or refused; especially when they who were cast out by one, were received to another: or when occasional Communion was either shuned by them who so joyned in another Church, or denied to such Sojourners, if they desired it: or, when one Church shewed Rage, Furie, and Bitternels against another; because of what they differed about. Instances of this are many: the Difference betwixt *Stephen* of *Rome*, and *Cyprian* of *Carthage*, came to that Height, that they would not Communicate together; one of them Anathematized the other: and it spread so far that the Churches of *Europe*, and these of *Africk* did concern themselves in it. *Eusebius* (cited *Catal. Test. verit. p.* 26.) ascribeth the Persecution under *Diocleſian* chiefly to the Contentions of Priests and Bishops. *Basilius Magnus* cited by the same Author, *p.* 27. maketh an Observation, that among Men of other Imployments there was much Concord; *in Sola vero Ecclesia Dei, pro qua Christus est mortuus, & in quam Spiritum Sanctum abunde & opulenter effudit, maximum dissidium, & vehementem multorum, tum inter ipsos, tum contra Divinam Scripturam dissentionem observari, & quod horrendissimum est, ipsos Ecclesiæ præsides in tanto & Animi & Opinionum inter se dissidio constitutos, tantaque contrarietate mandatis Domini repugnantes, ecclesiam Dei crudeliter dissipare & gregem ipsius absque ulla commiseratione perturbare, ut & ipsis nunc si unquam, prodeuntibus & florentibus iniquis, impleatur illud Apostoli, ex vobis ipsis exsurgent viri perversa loquentes, ut abstrahant post se discipulos.* The Learned *Owen*, *of Apostacie*, *p.* 500. observeth that *the Scandalous Divisions among Christians, especially among their Leaders was the first step of the visible Degeneracie of Christians; and afterward became the Sport of the Heathen.*

§. 7. The Unity of Associated Churches who were Governed in Common, to which Government that of the several Congregations was subordinate, consisteth especially in the Agreement of the Rules in their Meetings for Managing the Publick and Common Affairs of the Churches, and each Member submitting to what was Determined by Common Consent of the Plurality; whether it were Injunctions, Reproofs, or Censures. The Breach of this Unitie was when any, one, or moe, of that Ruleing Society took on them to Oppose or Contradict what was Determined as above-said: much more when they did that by themselves, which should have been done by the whole, as when *Felicissimus*

cissimus, and some others of the Presbyters of *Carthage*, absolved some of the Lapsed, neglecting *Cyprian* the Bishop, or *Præses*, and the Body of the Presbyters: which *Cyprian* did Highly, and Justly Resent. Or when they, or any of the People, refused Subjection to the just Decisions of the Church Rulers Assembled. This sort of *Schism* is much of the same Nature with what followeth, I insist no further on it: for it is the same Thing, as to Church Unity, whether any Minister of the Church Rebell against the Bishop; if that be the right Government of the Church; or against the Synod, Presbyterie Classical, or Congregational; if that be the way that CHRIST hath Appointed. Yea, it is the same Breach of Unity, to set up another Bishop, beside the true Bishop of the Church; or a new Synod or Presbyterie, beside these which one was before a Member of, or Subject to; yea, or to gather a Church, and to set up a Minister and Meeting in a Parish, beside what was orderly there settled. Wherfore the last sort of Unity, or *Schism*, is that which belongeth to a particular, Congregational Church. This Unity if we take *Schism* in a large Sense, is broken by Diversitie, either of Opinions, or Affections, among the Members of the Church; when they Disagreee, and Manage their Differences with Strife and Contention; even though there be no *separation* in their publick Exercises of Religion. At *Corinth* there was such a *Schism*; they came together, and yet the Apostle saith, *there were Divisions* (σχισματα) *among them*. But *Schisms* in the Church, were of old, and now are, taken in a more restrained Sense for a causeless *separation* from the Church in the publick Exercises of Religion; either by withdrawing only, or by setting up another Religious Society also. This the Fathers Expressed, sometimes by *Rebellion against the Bishop*; or *withdrawing* from him; that is Denying due Subjection to the Pastor of that Church; and Obedience to him with the Presbyterie. So it is sometimes Expressed by them; but even when the Presbyterie, or Church is not named; it is so to be understood; and the Bishop is so often Named, because he was (in these times) the constant *Præses* of their Meetings; and even this Prælation (though without sole Jurisdiction, into which it did at last, Issue) began early to be too much taken Notice of, as I have more fully shewed else-where.

§ 8. I shall first shew that *Schism* was often (yea ordinarilie) thus understood by the Ancients. Next, that they did not always blame this Disobedience and Separation as a Sinful *Schism*: but allowed it to be done in some Cases, and for some Causes. For the former, *Cyprian* in

in many Places condemneth this, as *Schism*: *Ep.* 40. §. 4. *Edit.* 1593. *Deus unus est, & Christus unus, & una Ecclesia, & Cathedra una, super Petrum Domini voce fundata; aliud Altare constitui, aut Sacerdotium novum fieri, præter unum Altare, & unum Sacerdotium non potest; Quisquis alibi collegerit spargit, Adulterium est, impium est, quodcunque Humano Furore instituitur, ut Dispositio Divina violetur.* Here it is evident that he speaketh of *Separating* from the Church; also, *Ep.* 55. §. 6. *Neque enim aliunde nata sunt Schismata, quam unde, quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur; nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Judex vice Christi cogitatur.* This also Pointeth at Deserting the Lawful Pastor of the Church; and Setting up a Meeting in Opposition to him, and the Church. What he saith of one Priest, and one Judge, cannot be meant, that the Presbyters were no Priests; for that was contrarie to the known Sentiments of *Cyprian*; but it is to be understood of one Church Authoritie, in Opposition to Setting up Altar against Altar; likewise, *Ep.* 64. §. 4. *Hi sunt ortus atque conatus Schismaticorum male cogitantium, ut sibi placeant, ut Præpositum superbo tumore contemnant: sic de Ecclesia receditur, sic Altare profanum foris collocatur; sic contra Pacem Christi, & Ordinationem atque Unitatem Dei rebellatur.* Other Testimonies to the same Purpose might be brought, *Ep.* 69. §. 7. he calleth the Church, *Plebs Sacerdoti unita, & Pastori suo Grex adhærens*: and *Ep.* 38. §. 1. saith of *Schismaticks*, *Cum Episcopo portionem Gregis dividere; id est a Pastore oves, & Filios a Parente separare, & Christi Membra dissipare.* And *de Unitate Eccles.* §. 10. he saith of them, *Conventicula sibi diversa constituunt*; so also *Ignat. ad Magnes. p.* 32. *Edit. Vossii, quarto,* 1646. μὴ βεβαιῶς, κατ' ἐντολὴν συναθροίσεαι, *they conveened not firmly* (that is, it would not hold in Law) *according to the Command*; and *Ep. ad Smyrn. p.* 7. ὁ λάθρα ἐπίσκοτε τὶ πράσσων, τῷ διαβόλῳ λάτρευει: *who doth any thing* (*viz.* in Religious Matters) *without the Knowledge of the Bishop*: (that is, in a Parish without the Pastor, or in a Presbyterie, without them orderlie met, with their Præses) *he serveth the Devil.* The second thing above-mentioned is, to shew that there were some Causes, for which the Ancients allowed People to *separate* from their Bishop, or the Church, that they were Members of. I find but three expressie mentioned, 1. Apostacie from the Christian Faith: as in the Case of *Martialis* and *Basilides*, who Sacrificed to Idols, *Ep. Synodal. apud Cyprian. quæ est*, 65. §. 1, 3, 4. where, after many Words to this Purpose, are these, *Propter quod Plebs obsequens præceptis Domini, & Deum metuens, a peccatore Præposito separare se debet, nec se ad Sacrilegi*

trilegi Sacerdotis Sacrificia miſcere ; quando ipſa maxime habeat poteſtatem vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recuſandi. A ſecond Cauſe was *Hæreſie, Irenæ. lib.* 1. *c.* 13. *Oportet longe fugere ab eis*; ſpeaking of *Hæreticks*. *Origen. Homil.* 7. *in Ezek.* alloweth one to ſeparate from his Biſhop: *Si habueris* (ſaith he) *occaſionem Doctrinæ peſſimæ, & aliena ab Eccleſia dogmata. Theodoret. lib.* 1. *c.* 22. telleth us that at *Antioch* many of the Clergy, and People withdrew, and ſet up private Aſſemblies; when three *Arrian* Biſhops *Eulalius*, *Euphronius*, and *Placentius* were ſet over them. And *lib.* 2. *c.* 24. that they did the like when *Leontius*, who favoured the *Arians*, was ſet up: and that *Flavianus* and *Diodorus* took the Charge. *Vincent. Lyrin. adverſus Hær. c.* 16 relateth of *Photinus* Biſhop of *Sirmium*, a Man of great Abilities, that when the People diſcerned his Error, *Quem antea quaſi Arietem Gregis ſequebantur, eundem deinceps veluti Lupum fugere cœperunt. Thirdly*, The Scandalous and Wicked Life of a Biſhop: which the Words cited out of that Synodal *Ep. in Cyprian*, a little above, do plainly bear; and *Irenæ. lib.* 4. *c.* 44. *Qui vero Presbyteri ſerviunt ſuis voluptatibus, & non præponunt timorem Dei in cordibus ſuis, ſed contumeliis agunt reliquos, & principalis confeſſionis tumore elati ſunt, & in abſconſis agunt mala, ab omnibus abſiſtere oportet.* I ſhall not now determine whither this was ſound Doctrine; if it be underſtood of Peoples deſerting their Paſtor for his Perſonal Immoralities, before the Sentence of a Church Judicatorie be interpoſed. I only relate the Opinion of the Ancients. *Origen.* indeed ſaith *Homil.* 7. *in Ezech.* that they ſhould not, for his Scandal, deſert the Faith that he Preached: But he ſpeaketh nothing of their deſerting his Miniſtrie, nor contradicteth the reſt whom I have cited.

§ 9. I now come to conſider what Apprehenſions Modern Writers have had of *Schiſm*. And here were a large Field to Expatiat in; If I ſhould Examine all or moſt of them, ſo many have written on this Subject, and ſo different their thoughts are of it. Wherefore I chuſe one, whom, I think my Antagoniſt will not except againſt, the Learned Biſhop of *Worceſter*, in his *Irenic. p.* 109. The Sum of whoſe Diſcourſe is; all are bound to joyn into ſome Church Societie; and being ſo joyned, ſhould continue in that Societie, till his Communion with them becometh Sin. Now for what maketh it Sin to continue in Church Communion, and conſequentlie warranteth *Separation*; he ſuppoſeth, that Corruption in the Eſſentials of the Conſtitution of the Church, may warrant it; but where there are Corruptions crept into a true Church,

Church, yet remaining such, he saith the Question is, whither we may *separate* from such a Church, for purer Administrations; particularly, whither we should *separate* from a Church, because of Corruptions in the Exercise of Discipline: he determineth it, that one may *separate* where there are Corruptions in Doctrine and Practice, which are avowed; and owning them, is required as the Terms of Communion with the Church: he alloweth in that Case, not only Noncommunion, but a total and positive *Separation*: but he telleth us, that where Soundness of Doctrine is retained, but some Corruptions in Practice are tollerated, but not imposed, *Separation* is unlawful on that Account. He saith thirdly, where Doctrine is sound, but some unlawful, or suspected Practice is required to be owned, and conformed to, denying of such Conformitie and Communion with the Church in these things is lawful, but positive *Schism*, or erecting *Altare contra Altare* is not lawful. These are Concessions of that profoundly Learned Writer. Against which I have nothing to object, but what I have elsewhere Debated with him, *viz.* Where some unlawful, or suspected Action is required to be done by Ministers or People, and if the Church so imposing, will not suffer them to have Communion with her in any of Gods Ordinances, unless they will conform in these, both they must do (for keeping a good Conscience) and he alloweth them a Negative, and Partial *Separation*: and the Church forceth them on a Positive and Total *Separation*: what shall they do in that Case? either they must live without Gospel Ordinances; or they must set up Meetings wherein they must have them: the former is unreasonable; the latter, is, that Positive *Separation* which he condemneth. I wish he, or any else, would tell us what is to be done in that Case. Let us then, improve that general, and indisputable Maxim; that we ought not to joyn with any Church, however commendable she be in many things, when our joyning doth engage us in any Action that is our Personal Sin: and that other Truth, which cannot be denyed; that when People are driven away from partaking of the Word and Sacraments with the Church, unless they will do that which is sinful, or that they, after their uttermost Diligence and Sinceritie in Searching, apprehend to be sinful; they ought not wholly to live without the Word or Sacraments; and it will clearly follow, that a positive *Separation*, even from a true Church; and setting up a Church in a Church, is not only lawful, but is a Dutie; and the Sin of that *Schism* doth not ly on them who so leave the Church, or are driven from her; but on that Church

Church which requireth such unlawful Terms of Communion, and imposeth them with such Rigour.

§ 10. Having thus Prefaced to our Debate about *Schism.* I proceed to Examine what my Adversarie bringeth to prove the *Scots* Presbyterians to be *Schismaticks*; which he attempteth without making any Distinction among them: though he knoweth there were different Practices among them, with respect to joyning in Communion with the Episcopal Church. He saith, *there is not a Church on Earth, with which they can joyn in Communion, without fear of being polluted.* It was Answered, that *we can joyn with the Churches of Holland, France,* (when the Protestants had their Assemblies there) *and Geneva, &c.* It was not said by the Author whom he refuteth, *that we dislike several things in these Churches*; but by him: and it was Answered, *we can communicate with a Church that is not so pure as we wish: what we dislike we shun the Practice of it; but do not, for that, refuse to communicate with the Church where it is found.* His Refutation of this is, *at this rate it will be hard to find Schismaticks in all the Records of the Church.* This is most false: for some did cast off Communion totally with the Church, and set up separate Meetings, when they could blame no part of Church Practice: but had Quarrels with the Persons that governed the Church. As in the Case of *Felicissimus,* who quarreled with *Cyprians* Promotion, and several others who made *Schisms,* because they could not be made Bishops. Again, he argueth, *we cannot be said to be Members of a particular Church, or to hold Communion with it, if we do not joyn in their Worship, as it is established among them.* This is easily Answered by a plain Distinction; unless we joyn in their established Worship, as to the greatest and chief Acts of it; *conceditur*: as to all the parts of it, even to the least, *negatur.* I may joyn with a Church in the Word and Sacraments; and yet if they have a Holy Day or two beside the Sabbath, may forbear, yea I may, without this, be a Member of that Church (if they will suffer me) which all the Reformed Churches do, except the Episcopal Church of *England.* I shewed before, that the Ancients did not place the Unity of the Church in an Uniformity in these Punctilio's, (so they who owne them, do reckon them) and the Modern Churches, mostly are of the same Sentiments, and Practice. In Confirmation of this his Argument, he hath these Words, *p.* 214, 215. *Since he forbears the Practice of these things he disliketh, why may he not be said to hold Communion with all visible Churches on Earth.* And instanceth not only in the Churches of

France; but in the *Roman* Church. This is an Absurdity beyond what he is aware of; for some Churches we are obliged wholly to flee from; because of Fundamental Errors, Idolatry, and horrid Corruptions of all Ordinances: so we *separate* totally from the Church of *Rome*, so the Orthodox of old refused to Communicate with, or be Members of the *Arian* Churches; yet they did not shun Communion with some Churches, that differed from them in small Matters, as I have shewed above, §. 4. of this Section. And the Learned *Stillingfleet* (as I have observed already) alloweth of a Partial Noncommunion, where Communion is not totally cast off. What he saith, of our *no more coming near a Liturgy than we would Sacrifice our Children in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom*: these I say, are not the Words of Truth and Soberness; nor have they so much of Argument in them, as of unreasonable Sarcasm; and are not to be regarded. Cannot one dislike a greater and lesser Evil, unless his Aversion to both be equal?

§ 11. He falleth next on the *Doxologie*, *p.* 216. and doth insinuate without any Shadow of Truth or Candor, that *we turn out the Episcopal Clergy for presuming to retain it in Publick Worship*: all *Scotland* knoweth the contrary. We do not use it, but we never laid such Weight on using it, as to forbear all Communion with a Congregation where it is used; I called it *a Humane Composure*. He saith, *the Matter of it is Orthodox and Unquestionable*; *Ergo*, it is no Humane Composure; *non sequitur*; I said; *there is no Warrant for constant Use of it*. He saith, *there is as good Warrant for it, as there is for Extemporary Prayer in Publick Worship*. This is false; we read of no Praying by a Book, or set Form; but the Spirits Help, not that of the Book, is the Help we must look for, not only as to the Manner, but the Matter of our Prayers; *what we should Pray for*; *Rom.* 8. 26. But I insist not on this; he confesseth it to be a Digression; and but toucheth it slightly; I judge it a very impertinent Digression, (but I behoved to follow as he leadeth) for I think neither Ancient nor Modern Divines will call them *Schismaticks*, who cordially joyn with the Church where they live in all of her Worship, except this; and it seems he hath little Ground to prove the Presbyterians *Schismaticks*, that he bringeth in this to help out his Proof against us. It is false also, that *all the Churches abroad have Humane Ceremonies so twisted with their Solemn Worship, that Presbyterians cannot joyn with them*. We have often (and do when occasion serveth) very cordially, and to our Edification, joyned with them; and yet partake in none of these: nor

is

is ſo much of theſe among them as he would make us believe. Another of his Arguments to prove us *Schiſmaticks* is, *p.* 215. *If the preſent Presbyterians had lived a hunder and fifty years before the Council of Nice, there was then a neceſſity (by their Principles) to ſeparate from the Unity of the Church; becauſe all the things they ſcruple were then practiſed.* It was Anſwered, that the Hierarchy was not then in the Church; this he taketh no notice of, nor ſhall I, for we have already Debated it ſufficiently. Neither do we make the Beeing of the Hierarchy the Ground of *Separation*; but that Miniſters, at leaſt, muſt owne it, or have no Communion with their Church. But he telleth us of a great many other things that were then uſed, as *Anniverſary Days, Significant Ceremonies, the Sign of the Croſs, &c.* And *beſeecheth me to read ſome of the ancient Monuments of the Church.* I thank him for his good Advice; I have followed it, in ſome degree (though I cannot Brag of my Reading, nor Vilifie others, as if their Reading were ſhort of mine) before he gave it; and ſhall yet further, as I can; and though I find that ſome of theſe crept early into the Church; (and yet, may be, not ſo early as he imagineth) I do not find that the ancient Church placed her Unity in theſe things; and I think, by the ſmall Reading that I have attained, I have proved the contrary, and therefore if we had then lived, we might have been counted no *Schiſmaticks*. I further Anſwer, the Ancients placed *Schiſm*, with reſpect to the Univerſal Church, in her Heterodoxy, not in different Rites; and therefore we maintain Unity with the Fathers, while we believe as they did; for that Unity that ſhould be in a particular Church; we are not capable of it, but with that Church where we converſe, not with that which was 1600 or 1700 years ago; therefore it is improper to ſay we are *Schiſmaticks*, becauſe of what we would have been in that poſſible Caſe that never was.

§ 12. His third Conſideration to prove us *Schiſmaticks* is, that *our Predeceſſors condemned the ſame Practices as Schiſmatical*; the Anſwer to this was given; *this Argument was uſed by him before, and I Anſwered it before*: He ſaith; I leave him to Gueſs where it was brought, and Anſwered: and truly I thought it was an eaſie Gueſs, being but in the end of the former page, *viz.* 33. If he had read heedfully what he undertaketh to refute, he could not have been at a Loſs here. It was there told him, that *as the former Presbyterians did not ſeparate from the Epiſcopal Church, ſo nor did all of them of late: and they who did, were driven away by the Apoſtacy of his Party, from the way that they had engaged in; and that by forcible*

changing of the Church Government, without her Consent, or any Means used to satisfie the Consciences of them who scrupled. I add, in former times Presbytery continued, only Bishops were superinduced; therefore Ministers did not leave their Stations, till driven from them: but at the last Settling of Episcopacy, Presbytery was razed, (so far as Men could) and what Shew of it was left, stood on the Foot of the Bishops Authority, who Called and Impowered them to Act. This true Presbyterian Ministers could not submit to; it being an owning of a Power in the Church, which they are convinced is unlawful. His fourth Argument is, *No Schismaticks can be named in the Records of Ecclesiastical History, to whom that Name is more agreeable, than to the Presbyterians in Scotland.* In Answer to this, the *Donatists* were mentioned, as *Schismaticks*, more justly reputed such, than the *Scots* Presbyterians can be. And the *Novatians* might also have been brought as another Instance; to whom I confess, what was said agreeth more directly, *viz.* That they *separated*, because the Church admitted the Lapsed to Repentance. His Refutation of this is a long Discourse of the Original of the *Donatists*; in many Circumstances, that do no way concern the present Purpose: and in which are some Mistakes, as far from the Account that we have in the ancient Records, as that Lapse of Memory is, ascribing somewhat to the *Donatists*, which agreeth better to the *Novatians*; and yet there was great Affinity between these two sorts of *Schismaticks*; they both had the same Rise; *Donatus* in *Africk*; and *Novatus* a Presbyter at *Rome*; (together with one of the same Name, who, upon Discontent, came from *Carthage* to *Rome*, and joyned with him in making a *Schism*) both of them were, (as they thought) disobliged by the Election of a Bishop, the one, that *Cæciliænus* was Elected; who (as he alledged) was ordained by a *Traditor*; yea, was a *Traditor* himself; that is, in time of Persecution, had given their Bibles to the Heathen to be burnt; the other, that *Cornelius* was made Bishop; both of them pretended a greater Zeal for the Purity of the Church, than the rest of the Pastors had; the one, that all the Churches had fallen into Apostacy, through their Communion with them who had been *Traditors*; the other, that they who so had fallen, or otherwise, in time of Persecution, were not to be admitted to Church Communion again, nor get Absolution; though he, nor his Followers did not deny, that they might obtain Mercy from God, upon true Repentance, (the contrary of which some impute to them) both of the Sects were called καθαροι, *Puritans*; both of them *separated*

parated from all the Churches of the World; and managed their *Separation* with unreasonable Rigour; especially the *Donatists*, and among them the *Circumcelliones*; who were furiously enraged against all who differed from them: Both of these *Schisms* spread far and wide. It is observed by some, that there were of both sorts, Men of strict Lives. Though some of the Ancients tell us of their *Heresies*; yet others acknowledged their Agreement with others in the Faith: of the *Donatists* *Cresconius* said, they confessed the same Jesus born, dead, and risen again; they had the same Religion, and the same Sacraments, and there was no Difference about the Practice of Christianity. *Augustine* confesseth that their Difference was not about the Head, but about the Body, not about Christ, but about his Church. *Augustin. de Unitat. Eccles. c.* 4. *and Epistle* 45. saith, *they were agreed in the Creed, in Baptism, and other Sacraments of our Lord*; also *Ep.* 162. he telleth us, that *Miltiades in a Synod at Rome, and his Brethren, offered to hold Communion with the Bishops that Majorinus (whom Donatus and his Party had set up in Opposition to Cæcilianus) had ordained*; which Condescendence is also evident, from *Collat. 1. Carthag. Art.* 16. *apud Optat. Milevit. p.* 45. 6. *Edit. Paris.* 1631.

§. 13. Our Author tells us, that *we ought to have named Schismaticks in the Primitive Church; whose Pleas when Represented with all possible advantage, are not so fair and plausible as these of the Presbyterians.* I Answer the *Donatists* and *Novatians* were *Schismaticks* in the ancient Church; and their Pleas for their *Separation* were not so fair as these of the Presbyterians, which I shall shew in these Three things. 1. They had no good, nor sufficient Ground to *separate*; we declare that we will never *separate*, because the Church admitteth scandalous Sinners to Repentance and Communion, as the *Novations* did: nor because some Ministers and People, are not so innocent as they should be, as the *Donatists* did: we condemn their *Schism* as much as he doth. What the *Donatists* alleged was false in matter of Fact, as was made appear. *First*, By some Judges appointed by the Emperour, to try the matter: next by a Synod held at *Arles*: And *lastly*, by the Emperour, after a full Hearing of the Matter: and if it had been true; it was no just ground of *Separation*; though it had been a great Grievance. The *Novation* Plea had no weight in it at all, because the Church was not culpable in such Admission, which they did unreasonably blame. Can he Charge the Presbyterians with any thing that is so unreasonable. What we dislike is, an usurped Power set up in the Chuch; and humane Ceremonies

imposed

impoſed on us; and our owning of theſe formally in Words, or materially in our Practice, is made a condition of our Communion with the Church. It is true, if he can Prove our Scruples to be unreaſonable; and that what we diſlike is Warrantable; he may blame us, for none Complyance; but what is the Queſtion between him and us; if we Scruple without cauſe, the blame lieth on us: if not, the Guilt of *Separation* lieth on them who impoſe ſuch things. Wherefore the Determination of this Point, who is culpable in the *Separation* that is in the Church at Preſent, dependeth on the Queſtion now under Debate, about Epiſcopacie and Ceremonies. 2. We always were willing to unite with them, if they will remove the Stumbling-blocks that lie in our ways; which themſelves confeſs to be indifferent. I mean the Ceremonies; and if they will not require our owning of Epiſcopacie, directly nor indirectly. The *Novations* nor *Donatiſts* never offered ſuch terms of Peace. It is not what they do that skareth us from them, but what they will needs force us to do. 3. We do not Exclude any of them from our Communion; as the *Schiſmaticks* of old did. Who either of their Clergy, or of the People have been Excluded from the LORD'S Supper with us, on account of their Opinion in the things that are matter of our Debate. 4. We do not condemn their Church, as no Church; as the *Donatiſts* did to all beſide themſelves; we condemn only ſome things among them that are of inferior moment. 5. It is evident that themſelves are the cauſe of all the *Schiſm*; and they are not of the healling temper that the Church was of, which had to do with the *Donatiſts*: that Church was willing to forbear them, even in their moſt unreaſonable *Separation*; and to indulge ſuch as were of a Religious Converſation; but differed from the Church without cauſe, in matters of leſſer moment. The Epiſcopal Church had no Pity on ſuch as differed in indifferent Ceremonies, acknowledged to be ſuch; but drave them away from their Communion unleſs they would comply in theſe, which they could not do without wounding their Conſcience. If he can Prove that we deny Communion with the Epiſcopal Church, on *on frivolous pretences*, as he ſuppoſeth, *p.* 222; he gaineth what he contendeth for; but he findeth it eaſier to ſuppoſe this, than to Prove it. It was ſaid by his Antagoniſt, that the *Donatiſts forſook their lawful Paſtors; which Presbyterians do not: the Biſhops being none of our Paſtors.* He ſaith this is the very Crime of the Presbyterians, in their Erecting Altar againſt Altar. Anſwer, 1. That is not all that we plead for, as is clear from what hath been ſaid. I have

have ſhewed §. 8. Caſes in which, even lawful Paſtors may be forſaken; and *ibid.* that this may be done when they require unlawful conditions of Communion with them. But I ſay, 2. That the Biſhops ſet up in *Scotland* were none of the lawful Paſtors of the People over whom they pretended to Rule. And I am willing that Matter be Determined. 1. By the ſtrength of Argument; if he can Prove the Warrantableneſs of the Power that they Claim to, we muſt yield. 2. By the Suffrage of the ancient Church, which was poſitive, plain and unanimous in this, that the People ſhould chuſe their own Biſhop, and other Church-Officers; ſee Inſtances, *Enquirie into the Conſtitution*, &c. *of the Primiiive Church*; c. 3. p. 63. *Append. ad Catalog. Teſt. veritat.* p. 33. The ancient Church did never own a Paſtoral relation, in any Man, to a People, on whom he was thruſt by the Magiſtrat, or any Power not Properly Eccleſiaſtical, and without their own Conſent. This is our caſe, the Church of *Scotland* was in Peaceable Poſſeſſion of Presbyterian Government, the Magiſtrat, not the Church, made a Change, and ſet Men over the People to be their Biſhops, whoſe Office they could not own, and whoſe Perſons they had no concern in: I Queſtion whether the Primitive Church (I mean the firſt Ages) would have counted it *Schiſm* to diſown ſuch, and to cleave to their own lawful Paſtors, who had been called by them, ſetled by Church Authority among them, and laboured among them, to their Comfort and Edification. His denying the *Donatiſts to have taken their Name from Donatus a caſis nigris*, is contrarie to *Petavius, rationar: tempor: lib. 6. p.* 249. I know not what Vouchers he hath for him: his Aſſertion, *p.* 220. that *Presbyterians have thrown Deacons out of the Church*, is ſo falſe, that it is a wonder how he could have the Confidence to Affirm it: If he underſtand it of Preaching Deacons, he ſhould have ſaid ſo: and proved ſuch an Officer to have been appointed by CHRIST to be in his Church.

§. 14. His *Fifth* Reaſon to prove the Presbyterians *Schiſmatick*, is from the Doctrine of *Cyprian*; of which he is ſo confident; that he maketh my aſſerting that a Biſhop in *Cyprians time was no more but a Paſtor of a Flock, or a Presbyterian Moderator, not a Dioceſan*; to be a plain Demonſtration that I have never read *Cyprians* Writings. If I had read much more than either he or I have, I ſhould not ſo often, nor ſo ſupercilioufly, vilifie others. If I have read little he will find it the eaſier to refute what I have Written. Another Learned Author of his Partie hath taken to task theſe few Lines in my *Def. of Vindic.* which he now under-

undertaketh to refute: Which Book I have Anſwered (with ſuch reading as I could attain, both of *Cyprian*, and other ancient Writers) in a Book Intituled the *Cyprianick-Biſhop Examined*; where I have endeavoured to Anſwer all that he hath here Written, before I ſaw it. I am not willing to Tranſcribe it, being the moſt part of that Book. He may read it, if he thinketh fit; and if he, or any other, will refute what is there ſaid of Epiſcopacie in *Cyprians* Age, I ſhall be willing to be Informed by him. His Triumphant Concluſion, *p.* 225. evaniſheth into ſmoak, if what hath been ſaid, be duly Conſidered. He begineth another Debate, about *Preaching Moralitie*; which he paſſeth in a Word, overlooking all that had been ſaid in Refutation of his former Book on that Head: While it was told him that not all the Clergy, but he, and ſuch as he, was ſo blamed. Alſo, that *Preaching Moralitie* was never Cenſured, but Applauded, and lookt on as neceſſarie; but what we Quarelled was, that ſome do only *Preach Moralitie*, and neglect holding forth to the People the aids of the Spirit, by which they ſhould obey the Law acceptably, and the Righteouſneſs of CHRIST, on account of which they, and their Works that are moraly Good, ſhould be accepted; and a great deal more to this purpoſe was Diſcourſed, to ſhew his Miſtakes in that Matter: to all which he maketh no Return, but that his Antagoniſt *had ſeen no Sermons of his in Print, nor heard him: and therefore could not tell what ſort of Doctrine he Preached.* I think there was ſufficient ground for thinking that he uſeth to Preach in that ſtrain, ſeing he ſo doth Defend and Applaud it; but much more occaſion was given for ſo thinking, from a large Diſcourſe in his Book; that I was then Refuting, Vindicating their way of Preaching, in which their is nothing of that which is the Marrow of Goſpel Preaching, *viz.* the imputed Righteouſneſs of CHRIST, and the influence of his Spirit, by which we muſt do that which pleaſeth GOD. His ſo often Rehearſing (as he hath done the Third time) an Error of the Preſs, which maketh a Paſſage that is unexceptionable to be *Nonſenſe* and *Blaſphemie*, after it had been Solemnly diſowned by the Author; this, I ſay, ſheweth the Mans temper: I am ſure this ſilly ſhift will Reflect more on himſelf, in the Eyes of them who are not Malicious, than it will on the Perſon whom he would Defame.

SECTION

SECTION XI.

Of the Government of the first Christian Church of Scotland.

ANother Debate my Antagonist Engageth in, wherein what we hold must be reckoned among *the New Opinions* of Presbyterians is, what way the Christian Church of *Scotland* was at first Governed; whether by Bishops, or the Pastors of the Church, acting in Parity? We cannot give a distinct and paricular Account of their way, in this Matter, because of the Silence, and Defectiveness of the History of these times; and therefore, it is a Mis-representation when he saith, that *we hold that they were Presbyterians*; if he understand Presbyterian Government in the the usual Sense, as made up of Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General-Assemblies; we suppose they had a Government in that Church; and that it was Managed by Church Officers, and directed by the Word of GOD, as they then understood it; for this we can bring no other Proof; but that they were Christians, and we owe them that Charity, having no cause to think otherwise of them: and I think this will not be Contested between him and me. All the Question that remaineth is, whether the Teachers of the Church had equal Power, and Ruled in Parity, or had Bishops set over them, who had the Power of Ruling the Church; the rest having only Power to Teach. We are for their Equality of Power; my Antagonist for Episcopal Jurisdiction to have been, even then, in the Church of *Scotland*. I do agree with him that this is *quæstio facti*, and must be determined by Testimonie; and that of Credible Witnesses, who might know the Truth of what they Assert. I have brought Credible History for what we say; all which he Rejecteth as *fabulous*; some of his Party (particularly *Spotswood*) bring Instances of Bishops in *Scotland*, at that time, without any to Attest the Truth of what he Writeth. Which of us, then, go on the best grounds? Our Author had in the *Apology* (which I take to be his) pretended to Refute what I had Written on this Head; *First Vindic. Question.* 1. *p.* 4. 5. all that he saith in the *Apology*, I Answered; *Deff. of Vindic. p.* 36. 37. he doth in the Book now before me, endeavour to Answer part of what was said (as he had also done in the *Apology*) overlooking what he thought not fit to touch. I shall now Consider what he here saith; omitting nothing that is Material: He

hath not yet cleared his Assertion that *Blondel took that History of the Culdees ruling the Church, from Buchanan and his temporarie Monks, Boetius and others, or such as were little removed from his own Age.* For *Blondel* doth not mention one Monk contemporarie with *Buchanan*; nor any Monk save *Fordon*, who was far removed from his Age; wherefore the Objection from the Word *Contemporarie* is not Obviated, nor Answered, by any thing said in this, or his former Book. It was Objected that *his Rejecting the Writers whose Testimonies were brought, as incompetent Witnesses, was to Raze the Foundation of the History of our Nation*, which he Answereth, by shewing that *it is the Establishing, not Razing of History, to require Competent Witnesses for what we Believe*: This is to divert into another Question; what was blamed in him was not, that Witnesses whose Testimony we receive, must be Competent; but whether these adduced by me, in the Debate, were such. I only Mark here; not Examine (being aside from our present Debate) what he saith, *p.* 230. that *if History be Destroyed, and the Moral Certainty that is conveighed by Testimony* (he must mean Humane Testimony) *then the Authority of Revelation falleth, and Atheism is Introduced; at least boundless Scepticism, and uncertainty.* Whether this tendeth not to make Scripture, and all our Religion to Depend on the Churches Testimony, let it be Considered. If the *Vindicator* said, that *we may believe a Matter of Fact without sufficient Evidence*, let him be loaded with as many Epithets as he can Invent; he Pleaded that *Buchanan, Boetius, Major, Fordon, Usher, the Centuriators, Baronius, Beda, and Prosper*, had given Account of the Affairs of the *Scots* Church, and if none of these be Competent Witnesses, our Historie is lost; and cannot be made up by the *Collateral Testimony of some of the Roman Historians*, who spake of our Affairs *obiter*.

§ 2. Our Author is at a great deal of Pains, from *p.* 231. to Prove, that *no History is to be Believed unless it be Attested by sufficient Witnesses, who had occasion to know what they Affirm*; I would gladly know who Opposeth him in this; he fully Proveth what was never Denyed by any Body, so far as I know; nor can it be Denyed by any Man in his Wits; I mean, without this History cannot be Believed upon the Faith of these Witnesses, which are thus incompetent; for by other Topicks a Matter of Fact, done 1000 years ago may be sufficiently Proved; as the Learned *Heideggerus* Proveth both many Antediluvian, and Postdiluvian, Passages, by Consequences drawn from Scripture, in his Excellent Book, *Historia Patriarcharum*; Wherefore I look on *Du Lamy's* Work, *de Authoritate*

thoritate Argumenti negantis in Quæſtionibus facti, to be of good uſe, and that the Popiſh legends are by that Argument ſolidly refuſed. I confeſs alſo, that there is much ſtrength in *Euſebius his neglecting of ſome Books as Spurious, becauſe not ſufficiently Atteſted.* Only I ſhall take Notice of a few things in his Managing of this his Diſcourſe, though I fully aſſent to the Concluſion of it, *viz.* that Hiſtory muſt be ſufficiently Atteſted: and then I ſhall State this Queſtion about the Credebility of Hiſtory, a little more clearly than he hath done. And, 1. I obſerve, that *p.* 233. he denyeth that *quæſtio facti can be otherwiſe Determined.* The contrarie of which I have already ſhewed, *viz.* that it may be Determined in ſome caſes, by Conſequences drawn from uncontеſted Matters of Fact. Next he ſaith, *ibid.* that *the Presbyterians hold the Affirmative in the preſent Debate, about our ancient Church-Government*; this is Queſtionable, if it be not downright a Miſtake: it is confeſſed on both hands that the *Culdees* taught the Church at that time; the Queſtion is either, whether they were Biſhops, or not; we hold the Negative; or if he Word it thus, whether they were any more than Presbyters, we ſay, no: or, whether there were Biſhops ſet over theſe Teaching *Culdees*, or not; we are ſtill for the Negative; wherefore we might put him to Prove his Affirmative. I further Object, that, in the end of the ſame *page*, he inſinuateth, that they againſt whom he Debateth do *believe all things without Examining the Teſtimonies on which their Credibilitie is founded.* We do not ſo with any thing of Moment; far leſs with all things. Yea, we do not ſo in the Caſe now under Debate. Another Remark I make on what he hath, *page* 231. *and* 235. *If a Matter of Fact be not Atteſted by any Credible Author living within* 200 *years of the Period in which ſuch a Thing is ſaid to have happened, it is to be lookt on as a Fable*: and he addeth that *Du Launy ſuppoſed that Orall Tradition could not carry any Matter of Fact further*; and to Ridicule any who might think otherwiſe, he hath deviſed a Ridiculous Storie of the *King of China*. This may ſuffer a little Correction; and muſt not be taken as a Principle, neither on his Authority, nor *Du Launy's*; more than a Storie of 200 years old can be. 1. It is hard to fix a Period, how far Orall Tradition can hand down a Storie to Poſteritie; eſpecially, if it be not about the *Credenda* of Religion: If I can believe a Storie of 200 years old, from a grave and wiſe Author, whoſe veracity I do not Queſtion; I know not why the Addition of 50, or a 100 years more, ſhould make it incredible, if it come from the ſame hand. Wherefore this is too peremptorie a

Decision: there are on the other hand, many cases in which, Oral Tradition may be very doubtful in far less time than 200 years. 2. If this Doctrine be received, what shall we think of the Histories of *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, and others, which our Author, as well as others, Citeth often and Confidently? It is true, they give us Vouchers out of ancient Writings; but many of these may be Proved to be Fabulous, by this same Argument: and this they do not always. 3. He forgetteth and contradicteth himself, in the very next *page*; while he sheweth, out of *Sir George Mackenzie*; that the *Bards repeated the Scotish Genealogies at their* Marriages, *Births, and other Solemnities*, and calleth this *an infallible Conveyance of true, constant, and perpetual Tradition*: here is but Oral Tradition; and it went beyond the Limits of 200 years; otherways, it could not be a sufficient Evidence for all the Kings that were before *Fergus* the Second; which is the Design for which *Sir George* bringeth it. 4. Good Historians, who make it their Business to Search into the Affairs of former Ages, may attain to some probable knowledge of what passed for more than 200 years, by Comparing one thing with another; which others who have not made that their Study cannot easily reach; yea, they do not always set down all the Grounds of what they Write, for that would oblige them, sometimes to write a Controversie, instead of a Historie. I say not this to Oblige any Body to take all on Trust that Historians, even of the best Note, do Write; but to shew the unwarrantableness of Determining so dogmatically about the Credibility of History; Neither do I think Defending our Opinion about the ancient Church-Government in *Scotland* needeth the help of this Observation. Before he had peremptorly Condemned the Historical Evidence that we bring; he should have Answered what *Sir George Mackenzie* (an Author that he seemeth to value) hath Written against the Bishop of St. *Asaph*, p. 311. that *History requires, nor admits, no Mathematical, nor legal Proof. But is satisfied with Moral certainty inferred from probable Tradition, old Manuscripts, credible Histories, the Testimonie of forreign Authors; and probable Reasons.* 2. That our *Histories being already acquiesced in, and received by the Generality of* Mankind, *and especially by Criticks, Antiquaries, and Historians, the best Judges in such cases, need no Confirmation, nor further Proof.* And he sheweth, p. 6. that *Livies History hath no surer Grounds than Tradition, he Writing long after the time he speaketh of.* All this he fully Proveth.

§ 3. He

§ 3. He doth, *p.* 236. unjuſtly ſuppoſe, that I had aſſerted, that *the Hiſtory of our Nation muſt periſh, if there was no Presbyterian Church in Scotland, ſo near the Apoſtolick Age.* I ſaid not ſo, nor had Words to that Effect. What I did, and do affirm is, that *if none who have written the Hiſtory of this Nation, are to be believed, our Hiſtory is loſt*; for the Collateral Proofs from the *Roman* Hiſtorians; that he talketh of, could give us but a very lame Account of our Affairs. He maketh, *p.* 237. *theſe Recitations of the Bards to be twiſted with the Practice and Cuſtom of the Nation; and that by a conſtant, and uninterrupted Practice; and that from the firſt Colonies that were planted here:* now let me ask him; what Authority he hath for this; is not here an Oral Tradition (for theſe *Recitations* are not extant, but are periſhed time out of Mind) for much more than two hundred years, and thrice as many more. Nor doth Sir *George Mackenzie* give better Evidence for the Antiquity of our Kings, than we give for what we aſſert. He telleth us againſt *Saint Aſaph*, *p.* 129. that *the Tradition of our Nation might well be preſerved for ſix hundred years, which is far beyond our Authors Period.* That I Reaſoned againſt Chriſtmaſs from the Silence of the firſt Ages, is no way inconſiſtent with what I have, on this Occaſion, written; for if our Author can prove it from any other Topick, we ſhall not reject it. We ſhall tell him, whence the Hiſtorians had what we receive, and aſſert from them; when we come to Debate with him, the Truth of things we hold; we are now upon the general Argument, of the *Credibility of a Hiſtory.* We are not obliged to give him Inſtances of other Presbyterian Churches before *Calvin* and *Beza*, others have done it. What he ſaith of the *Waldenſes* I have diſproved, Section 1. §. 1. I promiſed, above, to ſtate this Queſtion, about the *Credibility of Hiſtory*, more clearly than he hath done; for which there is much need; for he neither diſtinguiſheth Matters related, nor Perſons relating, nor the Weight that is to be laid on what is related in Hiſtory. 1. Then Matters that are of no great Moment, whither they be true or falſe, we may receive with a Hiſtorical Faith, on more ſlender Grounds than what is of great Moment, or, the Conſequences of Believing which is of great Advantage, or in Convenience. Matters that we build an Article of Faith on, or that our Chriſtian Practice, yea, or that any great Worldly Intereſt dependeth on the Truth or Falſhood of what is told us, have need to have Credentials proportioned to the Streſs that is to be laid on them. And therefore I yield ſo far to this Author, that he ſhall not be obliged to believe what we aſſert

in

in this Matter, unleſs we bring ſuch Evidences as the Matter requireth, and is capable of. 2. The Credibility of a Hiſtorian, muſt bear ſome Proportion to the Degree of Aſſent, that we are to give to the thing narrated. If our Author will have us to look on any Hiſtory, as an infallible and irrefragable Ground of our Belief; he muſt give us more than the Teſtimony of Men; or the beſt Hiſtorians who are not Divinely Inſpired. As I have ſhewed Section 3. §. 31, 35. on the other hand, we talk not ſo high of the Hiſtorical Evidence that we bring, and therefore, a Probability of a lower Degree, than what he talketh of, may ſerve. 3. Tho the Credit of a Hiſtorian be not, by it ſelf, ſufficient to perſwade us of the Truth of what he ſaith, yet if it be ſupported by the Probability of the Thing, by Circumſtances that favour it, or the Teſtimonies of others; or by any good Topick, from which the Truth, or the Probability of the Thing may be inferred, the Hiſtory is not eaſily to be rejected. 4. The Perſons who write the Hiſtory are to be diſtinguiſhed, ſome of them have given Evidence of their Ignorance, Negligence, Fooliſh Credulity, and Liſtening to Fables; others have manifeſted great Learning, Induſtry, Care to Examine what they narrate; or are Atteſted by others to be Men of Probity, Learning, Wiſdom, and Exactneſs: certainly more Weight is to be laid on the one, tho living at ſome Diſtance from the Period he writeth of, than on the other, tho nearer to it. 5. They who live at great Diſtance from any Period of Time, may give great Light concerning what was done in it, if they do not barely Aſſert what they Fancy, nor Meaſure the Things of that Period according to the Opinions, Cuſtoms, the Dialect of their own Time; as many of the Hiſtorians that our Author layeth much Weight on, have done; but conſider Things as then they were Stated, and bring probable Grounds, either from the Hiſtories written by credible Perſons in, or near that Time, or from any other *Medium*.

§ 4. I now proceed to the Vindication of our Argument from Hiſtory, for the firſt Chriſtians in *Scotland* being Governed without Biſhops. He miſtakes when he ſaith, that I bring *Blondel* as a Hiſtorical Witneſs of this: I mentioned him only, as Citing theſe Authors which aſſert it. Which are, *Joan. Major. de geſt. Scotor. lib. 2. c. 2. Per Sacerdotes & Monachos, ſine Epiſcopis, Scoti in fide ſunt eruditi*; and before him, *Fordon Scoto-Chronicon. lib. 3. c. 8. Ante Palladii adventum, habebant Scoti fidei Doctores, & Sacramentorum Miniſtratores, Preſbyteros ſolummodo, vel Monachos Ritum ſequentes Eccleſiæ Primitivæ.* It is true, *Blondel* citeth alſo *Boet.* who was later

later than either of them: But what he citeth out of him, seemeth not to be so much to his Purpose; wherefore I wave that Testimony. Our Authors Answer to the other two Testimonies is, they were not competent Witnesses, living at so great a Distance from the Time they speak of. To which I Reply, *First*, they cannot be esteemed Partial Witnesses, being both of them Papists, and not Presbyterians: and it may be rationally thought, that if they had no sufficient Ground for what they said, they would rather have either said what made for the Way they owned, or at least suppressed what they had no good Warrant to assert, against their own Way. To this he saith, *p.* 245. that *the Monks advanced this Fable to gratifie the Popes Design of Exempting the* Religious Orders *from Episcopal Jurisdiction.* *Reply*, This doth not meet with our Case; for *Major* was no Monk; and so not concerned to tell a Lie to please the *Pope* in that Design. And for *Fordon*; whatever Temptation he might have, to endeavour the Lessening of the Extent of the Episcopal Power; he would not design to root out Episcopacy wholly out of *Scotland*, (which this Testimony tendeth to, for the Period he speaketh of) contrary to the universal Sentiments of that Church, whereof he was a Member. Wherefore that Consideration doth no way derogat from the Credibility of his Testimony. *Secondly*, We have no Ground to think that these Historians spake by Guess, or that they invented this Story; for the contrary of it cannot be proved: and the thing it self is not impossible; yea, Sir *George Mackenzy*, in his Advertisement before his Book against *Saint Asaph*, maketh it appear, that *in our Countrey there were very Ancient Manuscripts, and that the Priests learned our ancient History from the Druids*; and he maketh it clear, *p.* 2. *&c.* that *our Histories* (of which that of *Fordon* and *Major* are a part) *being received by the Generality of Mankind, especially by Criticks, Antiquaries, and Historians, ought not now to be called in Question.* And I must still think, for all that he hath said in Opposition to it, that the History of our Nation falleth, if these Authors are not to be believed; seing without them, he shall never be able to make up a *Scots* History out of *Roman* Authors. *Thirdly*, The same Author *p.* 5. sheweth that *Men satisfie themselves in most things, with the general Belief and Tradition of a People; that Manuscripts infer no Mathematical Certainty; but the Authors of them might mistake; that the Histories of all Nations are no better founded.* All which sheweth how unreasonable it is to Question the Authority of these Historians; especially when none do so, but one who is straitned with

with an Argument brought from their Teſtimony, againſt a Cauſe that he is fond of. It is alſo much to our Purpoſe, that the Learned *Uſher, de primord Eccleſ. Brit.* 808. citeth the ſame Paſſages, with Approbation; he citeth alſo *Balæus de ſcriptor. Britan.* affirming that *Palladius* was ſent, *ut Sacerdotalem Ordinem Romano Ritu inſtitueret*, which we may rationally think: was to ſet up Biſhops. Alſo the Learned Doctor *Forbes, Iren. p.* 157. citeth the ſame Paſſage of *Major*, and addeth of his own, *adeo ut Eccleſia Scoticana plus quam* 230 *annos erat abſque Regimine Epiſcopali*: and *Forbes* was Zealous for Epiſcopacy.

§ 5. The Teſtimony of theſe Hiſtorians is ſupported by other Hiſtorians, who ſhew *Palladius* was the firſt Biſhop that Ruled in the *Scots* Chriſtian Church; and that Church had Subſiſted, and had Government, and others of Chriſts Ordinances in it, above two hundred years, before *Palladius* came among them. This is Atteſted by *Baronius* and his Epitomator *Spondanus, ad ann.* 431. and by them taken out of *Proſper*, ſee *Spondan. p.* 592. this is more fully cleared, *firſt Vind. p.* 4. His Anſwer to this I now conſider. He ſaith, *p.* 244. that *the Controverſie cometh to this, whether Proſper ſaith, that two hundred years before Palladius was ſent to the Scots, there was a Presbyterian Church in Scotland*, this is a ridiculous State of the Queſtion, and made by none but himſelf: we affirm that *Proſper* ſaid, *that Palladius was the firſt Biſhop ſent to the Scots*: and we, *aliunde*, prove that there was a Chriſtian Church in *Scotland*, two hundred years before that time. Whence the Conſequence is clear, that during that Space, the *Scots* Chriſtians had no Biſhops. I muſt ly under his Charge of *Supine Negligence*, in not Reading the Authors I cite. I only may be bold to require him to make that appear. That he thus attempteth. *Baronius* ſaith in the ſame Place of *Palladius*, *Quem perductum etiam ad Hiberniam Inſulam, ſed cito mortuum, Probus in rebus geſtis Sancti Patricii ſcripſit, dictum eſt ſuperius. Hibernorum quidem Converſionem Deus Sancto Patricio reſervavit.* I hope the Judicious Reader will neither think it a Token of *Supine Negligence*, nor of my not Reading the Books I cite; that I did not Tranſcribe this. For it was no ways to the Purpoſe in hand; it might as well be ſo Conſtructed, that I did not write over all that followeth in *Baronius*, about *Saint Patricks* Deſcent, about his Ordination, his Inſtruction in Divinity, *&c.* But the Weight of his Objection lyeth in this, that *Baronius* and *Spondanus* underſtood *Proſper* ſo, as that *Palladius* was ſent to *Ireland*; and not to that part of *Britain* that we call *Scotland*. Here the *Enquirer* giveth me Occaſion to return

turn the Civility of a good Advice to him; that he would consider what he Readeth, and what he Citeth out of Authors: for it is against all Sense and Reason, to make *Baronius* and *Spondanus*, either mean this in this Passage, (or so to understand *Prosper*) of a Mission to *Ireland*, and not to *Scotland*. It is to make a flat Contradiction between their Meaning and their Words: Whereas they say, *Sanctus Prosper missum ait Palladium ordinatum Episcopum ad Scotos; quem perductum etiam ad Hiberniam, &c.* The Meaning then must be to our Author, tho he was *Missus* and *Ordinatus ad Scotos*; he was not sent to the *Scots*, but to *Ireland*. Do not the Words bear it in their very Face, that he was sent to *Scotland*, and was their first Bishop: and after he had been there for some time, he was brought over to *Ireland*; it is not said *Missus*, nor *Ordinatus*; but *Perductus*: his Mission was to *Scotland*; what Casuality or Design led him to *Ireland*, is not told us; neither is it *Prosper*, but *Probus* that mentioneth his going to *Ireland*: and that he never was in *Ireland*, I have shewed in the Place Cited.

§ 6. He further endeavoureth to overturn our Argument from *Prosper*, as he is Cited by *Baronius*; where he attempteth two things, 1. To shew that *Palladius in Prospers Sense, was not the first Bishop, that was in Scotland; but the first Bishop that was sent to them by the Pope.* This he buildeth on *Prospers* Words, both as they are Cited by *Baronius*, and also are in the *Augustane* Copy; the first are, *Basso & Antiocho consulibus, ad Scotos in Christum credentes, ordinatus a Cœlestino Papa Palladius, primus Episcopus mittitur.* And the other Copy is, *Basso & Antiocho consulibus, ad Scotos in Christum credentes, ordinatus a Cœlestino Papa Palladius, primus Episcopus missus est.* I see not what moved him to transcribe the Words twice; unless he see a Mystery that others cannot observe, in the Difference that is between *mittitur*, and *missus est*; but he will have *mittitur*, or *missus est, primus Episcopus* to signifie that he was not the first Bishop; but the first Bishop of the *Roman Mission*; if he be allowed to put what Sense on Mens Words he pleaseth, it must be so: *Baronius* and *Spondanus* did not so understand the Words; neither can any Man so understand them, unless his Preconceived Opinion do Darken his Mind, that he cannot see things as they are. If *Prosper* had thought that there were Bishops in *Scotland* before, he should have spoken more plainly, and told us, that the *Pope* sent him to Rule over the *Scots* Bishops, or, that whereas *Scotland* was formerly Governed by their own Bishops; the *Pope* would have them thenceforth Governed by such as he set over

them. He telleth us of ſeveral Biſhops ſent to other Churches; not to introduce Epiſcopacy; but to bring them in Subjection to the Pope. This I deny not, (tho he inſtanceth only in *Auſtine the Monk*, who was ſent to *England*) but this furniſheth an Argument againſt himſelf; for none of them is called *primus Epiſcopus* of ſuch a Nation, except he who was ſent to *Scotland*. *Auguſtine* is neither called *primus Monachus*, nor *primus Epiſcopus*, though, as *Beda, hiſt. lib.* 1. *c.* 23. hath it, he was *ordinandus Epiſcopus, ſi a Gente Anglorum ſuſciperetur*. He ſaith *it is not evident from Proſpers Chronicon, whether there was any Formed, Organized Church in Scotland, when Palladius was ſent by Cæleſtine.* This is wholly beſide the Purpoſe: for *Proſpers* Teſtimony is not brought for that End. Is it not enough that it is clearly proved out of Authentick Writers: that the *Scots* were Chriſtians *anno* 199, and *Palladius* came to them about 431. Now can he imagine, that the *Scots* Chriſtians all that time, were not an Organized Church; if he think that therefore they were Unorganized, becauſe they wanted Biſhops, this is to beg the Queſtion.

§ 7. His other Anſwer is not a Refutation of me, but of *Baronius*, who took the *Chronicon conſulare* for *Proſpers* Work; whereas our Author ſaith it is none of his; and for this he produceth the Authority of *Pithœus*: which is not ſufficient againſt that of *Baronius*. And even *Pithœus* himſelf confeſſeth that *Chronicon per conſules digeſtum, hactenus in omnibus Hieronymiani Chronici editionibus Proſperi nomine ſubjungitur*. All the Ground he hath for denying it to be *Proſpers* is, that the Stile differeth from what he calleth the true *Chronicon*, whereof a Fragment only remaineth. He telleth us alſo, that Doctor *Cave* ſaith, that the *Chronicon conſulare* is much Interpolated: but that doth not prove the Book ſpurious; neither doth it derogate from the Teſtimony we bring out of it; unleſs he can ſay that it is one of the Interpolations, may be, Foiſted in by ſome Presbyterian; which if he ſay, it will make the Presbyterians older than our Author will allow. He quarrelleth, that I had aſſerted, that *the Chriſtian Faith was received in Scotland in the beginning of the ſecond Century*; and calleth it *a Dream*; *becauſe we have no certain Records of any Progreſs of Chriſtianity made in the Iſland at that time.* He ſhould not have been ſo confident in this Matter, without Anſwering what was brought for that Aſſertion, or *Dream*, whatever he will call it. He ſhould have diſproved that *Donald* was our firſt Chriſtian King: that he began to Reign *anno* 199, that *Palladius* came to *Scotland* 431, in

in all which Space the *Scots* lived without Bishops. If I have brought our Christianity any nearer to the beginning of the Christian Æra; I shall confess an Error in Calculation, which I deny not that I may readily fall into. What he saith of Squeezing of his Words: I cannot Answer, for he neither tells where, nor wherein; for my Book *lying open to his Remarks*; the Reader must judge whether it be so, or not; and what Advantage he hath got against it; the Error of my Title Page, putting *of* in stead of *for the Clergy*, is not such as he would represent; if they do not owne it, he should crave Pardon for making it; if they do, I have not Miscalled it; tho I confess changing his own Word was an Oversight; but I hope it is not a Beam; but a Mote that he hath discovered, by his Critical Skill.

SECTION XII.

Of Ceremonies, and the rest of the Enquirers Quarrels with the Presbyterians, which have not yet been touched.

THe last Effort made by this Author against the Presbyterians in his *fifth Chapter*, is made up of his Essay against our Opinion about *Ceremonies*, and other Miscellany Purposes, which hardly can be reduced to one Head: which I shall consider as his Discourse shall bring them in. Before I Examine his Dissertation, I observe two things in general concerning it. The first is, the course Treatment he giveth the Presbyterians, without Exception, as if he had them under his Feet, in this Conflict, before he enter on the Debate. He calleth our Opinion (or rather his own mistaken Apprehension of it; for it is none of ours, as will by and by appear) *a silly Theorem, on which* he saith, *we have broken the Unity of the Church, and filled the Heads and Mouths of People with a thousand Airy and Unaccountable Fancies*: he calls what we say on this Head, *Raveries, and a Labyrinth of Idle Talk, Fooleries*. My other Observation is, his odd Representation of our Opinion, which he maketh to be altogether *new*, and *our own*: and indeed as he representeth it, it is wholly *new*, and none of ours, but *his own*: it is, that *a Significant Rite in the Worship of God, not founded upon Divine Institution, is Superstitious, Unlawful, and Abominable, and such as may Legitimate a Separation from any Church, where it is enjoyned to preserve Order and Uniformity*. Against this I have two Objections, 1. That we did ne-

ver condemn all Significant Rites in Religion, even tho they be not founded on Divine Institution. Uncovering the Head is a Significant Rite, and we know no Divine Institution for it; and yet we use it in the Worship of God, *viz.* Prayer, and several other Exercises; and will separate from no Church because of it. That a Minister Preach in a Decent Garb, and not in a Fools Coat, is a Significant Rite used in Religion, not founded on Divine Institution, yet we shall not separate for enjoyning that. This loose and indistinct Way of Refuting an Adversary, cannot Instruct, nor Convince any Body. I shall not Retaliate his Harsh Words, by giving this Way the Epithet it deserveth. They who write on this Subject with Judgment and Understanding, use to distinguish three sorts of Modes of Mens Actions; that are found in Religion, *viz.* *Circumstances*, *Rites*, and *Ceremonies*. Circumstances are Modifications of Actions, as Time, Place, Person; or, a Circumstance is any thing that accompanyeth an Action which is not of its Essence, but is used with it, relateth to it, and is an Accident, or Adjunct of it: and it may be such, either with respect to the Physical or Moral Beeing of the Action: Circumstances use to be sorted in these Memorial Verses,

Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando.
And *forma, figura, locus, tempus, stirps, patria, nomen.*

Circumstance is a Word of larger Extent than Rite, and that than Ceremony; a Rite is the Manner of going about any Action (chiefly that which is Publick or Solemn) confirmed by Law or Custom. In a more large Sense; it is taken for any Action or Thing that belongeth to the Mode or Solemnity of another Action, rather than to the Substance of it: such Rites are used in Judicatures, Marriages, Burials, Inaugurations, *&c.* some of them are Civil, some Military, *&c.* and some also are Sacred; when they are appropriated to Religion. A Ceremony is a Sacred Rite: the best Authors that I have seen, whether Heathen or Christian, Popish or Protestant, agree in this, that a Ceremony is peculiar to Religion: however the Word be sometimes, in common Speech, more largely taken. This applyed to our Purpose sheweth, that our Author doth widely mistake, when he representeth us as against Significant Humane Rites in Religion: we oppose only these of them which are appropriated to Religion, and so are Religious Rites, or Ceremonies. He cannot but know that there are many Actions used in Religion, which are not Religious.

§ 2. The

§ 2. The *second* Thing that I Obſerve in his Repreſentation of the Opinion of his Adverſtaries, is, that they found ſeparation on Ceremonies impoſed to preſerve Order and Unity. It is no ſo. Let them deviſe what Ceremonies they will (which are not down-right Idolatry) and impoſe them on the moſt plauſible pretences they can think on: yea, let them uſe them as much as they will; we do not think all this a ſufficient Ground of Separation from a true Church whereof we are Members: but if they impoſe on us Religious Rites, or Sacred ſignificant Ceremonies; ſo as we cannot be ſuffered to Worſhip God with the Church, unleſs we either approve them, or uſe them, this we think a juſt Cauſe of Separation: ſeing ſuch Complyance were our Perſonal Action, and ſinful in the ſight of God. And yet the Separation of them who thus ſcruple, is rather a paſſive Separation, than active: they are driven away, rather than run away. Let us now hear what he hath to ſay in Defence of the Ceremonies, the Queſtion about which he hath ſo Stated. He *will not gather together all our Raveries, but in a few Words, Vindicate the Practice of all Churches, &c.* Theſe are but Words. He had done wiſely if he had excepted the Apoſtolick Churches. And tho I deny not, but that ſome Ceremonies did early and unobſervably creep into the Primitive Church, and that through the Zeal of ſome Good Men, who ſaw not the Importance, nor bad Conſequences of ſuch Obſervations; it may be made appear that ſome of the Ceremonies that they now obſerve had no ſuch early Original; and that ſome of theſe which were obſerved in the *firſt* Ages are laid aſide by them. Of the firſt Sort, I inſtance *Kneeling* in the Act of receiving the LORD'S Supper, the *Croſs* in Baptiſm, and ſome of the *Holy Days*, of which before. Of the other Sort, I inſtance the *Trina Immerſio* in Baptiſm, the *Aagapæ*, *Baptiſing on Whitſunday*, or *Dominica in albis*, rather than on any other Day; the *Oſculum pacis*, all the Steps of the *Catechumeni*, and *Pœnitentes*, before they could be received into Communion with the Church; and many other things which one may find in *Albaſpin. Obſerv. Eccleſiaſt.* which is Compendized by *Keitembellius*: there are alſo not a few modern Churches who are not for the Cermonies as they are Pleaded for by Him and his Party. If what I have ſaid be Conſidered, his *firſt* Argument propoſed by way of Queſtion admitteth of an eaſie Anſwer. The Apoſtolick Church Worſhiped GOD without Religious Ceremonies not Inſtituted by CHRIST; and I hope he will own theſe as Societies of Men, who are to be more Conſidered than others. A ſett of Arguments he next bringeth.

bringeth. 1. *The Light of Nature teacheth us to Worship* GOD, *and all Men have Agreed in this, that Solemn Worship of the* DEITIE *ought to be performed in Unity and Society.* A. If he make the Consequence (which he hath Suppressed) to be, *Ergo*, we must have humane Religious significant Ceremonies; we deny this Consequence, as not having a shadow of Reason. Again, if this Argument have any weight, humane Ceremonies must be necessarie: And GOD cannot be Worshiped without them: and all the Presbyterians are not only Defective in their Worship; but there is a Nullitie in it through want of such Ceremonies: which looketh more like *Raverie* than any thing he can Charge us with. 2. Saith he, *This publick Worship should be fixed and Established by the Wisdom and Authority of Competent Judges, as to the Manner and Method. Ans.* 1. Are the Manner and Method of Worship Religious significant Ceremonies? The Method is a Circumstance; neither Rite nor Ceremonie: for the Manner, it is either some-what that is common to Religion, and other Publick and Solemn Actions; and it consisteth in some civil Rites, therefore used in Worship because they have by Custom, Obtained in other publick Solemnities: this manner of Worship is not to be Determined by the Wisdom and Authority of any particular Judges; but the Tacite Consent of the Nation bringeth it in by using it in all such Actions: So in the Apostles time, for a Man to *Prophesie with his Head uncovered*, and to *wear long Hair*; was a Manner of Worship not determined by any Council, but brought in by civil Custom, and so made decent, that it was a fault to do otherways: so it were a fault among us, for a Minister to Preach in an Antick and ridiculous Garb, which Custom hath made such. Or the manner of Worship is sometbing that is peculiar to Religious Worship; and in that case it is Religion, or Worship it self; being Designed, that by it GOD may be Honoured: tho it be a Mode of that Species of Worship: (*V. Gr.* the Cross is a Mode of Baptism) yet it is a piece of Worship it self; being devised for a Sacred signification, and being peculiar to Religion: this sort of *Manner of Worship* must be fixed and Established by the Authority of CHRIST, neither do I know any lower Authority of any Judge that is *Competent* for it.

§. 3. His *Third* Argument, or Axiom, is, that *we ought to express our Adoration in the publick Worship of GOD, by such significant Signs of Piety, and Devotion, as are known in that Nation where we live, to express our Reverence, and Esteem.* The former Distinction will easily shew how little this will make for him. If he speak of natural or civil Rites, that is, Actions, or Gestures,

Gestures, or Things, that Nature or civil Custom hath made so Expressive; we yield all that he saith, but if he mean Religious Rites, or Ceremonies; that is, such Things, Actions, or Gestures as have no place, nor are not lookt on as so Expressive, in any other Solemnity but in Religion; I deny his Assertion: for what ever Custom hath crept into a Church or Nation, which is peculiar to Religion; and tho it be never so well known in the Nation that the Church hath introduced it into Worship meerly by her own Authority; So as it is neither made decent by Nature, nor by Custom, in other Solemnities or Actions; nor enjoyned by Divine Authority, it ought not to be in the Church of CHRIST. Hence we can allow *Sighing, lifting up the Hands*, or *Eyes* in Worship; Nature hath made them Expressive: also *a grave and decent Garb*; because civil Custom hath made that fit. Also using *Water in the Baptism*, and *Bread and Wine in the LORD'S Supper*; because Divine Institution hath made them Significant and Useful: but the *Cross* in Baptism, the *Surplice*, &c. we cannot allow, because their Signification and Use in Religon ariseth from none of these; but only from Mans will. His *Fourth* Assertion is, *these significant Signs being indifferent in their Nature are variable according to the Age or Country with whom we have to do; and may be Changed by the Authority and Wisdom of our Superiors, as oft as there is sufficient Reason; of which they only are the Judges.* Other Ceremonialists use to Plead for the Churches Ceremonie-making Power with a little more Caution and Limitation; so as they are careful to Shut the Door against the Popish Ceremonies: Some because of their ineptitude, the Bulk of them, because of their Number, being a Burden: but this Author is troubled with no such Scruples, or Fetters, he setteth the Door as wide open as the *Pope*, or any Church-Rulers (yea, or Rulers of the State) please to have it: no other thing but their *Opinion*, and *Will*, can keep out a Deluge of Ceremonial Fopperies. That the Ceremonies we Contend about (I mean Religious Ceremonies) are indifferent in their own Nature, he supposeth: but this is not to Instruct, but to Hoodwink the Reader: for he should have Distinguished the Nature of a Significant Ceremonies: It hath a general Nature, as it is such an Action, *V. Gr.* the Motion of the Finger, whereby the transient Sign of the *Cross* is made on the Fore-head of a Child; let that pass for indifferent. It hath also a particular Nature, as it standeth in such Circumstances, *viz.* as it is Appointed to be annexed to Baptism; as it is Stated in Religion, and appointed to it: and as a Religious Signification for a

Spiritual

Spiritual end is put on it, and all this, not by CHRISTS, but by Mans Authority; we deny it to be indifferent in its Nature, while it is thus Considered: as it must needs be in this Debate. But suppose we should allow an Indifferencie to be in the Ceremonies, as they are humane Actions to be used in Worship; it is said without all Warrant, that *our Superiors may Determine, and take away this Indifferencie, and Change their Injunctions about these Actions when, and as often as they see Reason so to do*; tho no Body else can see any such Reason. This is to make our Superiours absolute, and to give them an arbitrarie Power, in these things that we can make appear to be parts of Religion; and which himself cannot deny to have a great influence on Religion, and in which it is nearly concerned. Beside to say that Superiors may Determine every thing that is in its Nature indifferent, wherein Religion is concerned, is to open a Door to so many Impositions as might make Gospel Worship a greater Yoke than that which the Jewish Church was not able to bear; as the Apostle saith, *Acts* 15. 10. For Circumstances of Actions are innumberable, and few of them are Determined and Enjoyned by the LORD. We know the Church may determine the Actions in, and about Worship, which are not Determined in the Word, and yet must be Determined: but that she may Determine what ever she thinketh fit, is not to be Admitted.

§ 4. He telleth us, *p.* 152. that *it is impossible to make Objections against the decent visible Motions of the Body in publick Worship, which may not be improved against the vocal Expressions of the Tongue.* If he must be allowed to Determine what Motions of the Body are decent; this his Assertion could be not Opposed: but there are who call most of these Bodily Motions decent, even in Worship, which are Learned at the *Dancing School*: which yet it were hard for the Church to Enjoyn: Wherefore these Motions that were made decent in Worship by Nature, by civil Custom other grave and serious Actions, or by Divine Institution, we make no Objection against them, but blame them who neglect them: but for Motions that Men will call decent, without ground from any of these, we make Objections (which yet have not been sufficiently Answered) against their being Injoyned in VVorship, which he shall never be able to Improve against all the Vocal Expressions of the Tongue. He saith *we allow all these.* VVhat he meaneth by so saying, I cannot Divine, we allow Vocal Expressions, and Bodily Motions too, that such of them as are fit should be used. But we do not allow that the Church, by her

her own Authority, without ſuch Warrant as is above-mentioned, ſhould enjoyn her Determinations either in the one or in the other. I hope he hath no ill meaning when he ſaith *Nature led us at firſt to the Worſhip of the DEITIE.* I think Revelation had as early, and as effectual a hand in it, after the Fall. I confeſs Nature alone will lead Men to Worſhip the DEITY; but that Worſhip will not be ſuch as even this Author will think ſutable to Goſpel Purity; but will have worſe Mixtures than thoſe that we Contend about. He concludeth, that *the Reverence we owe to GOD, muſt needs bring along with it theſe outward Significations of reſpect that are made Decent by Cuſtom and Authority, to whoſe Deciſion alone GOD left theſe exterior Rituals of Worſhip.* Thus he ſtill endeavoureth to lurk under ambiguous Expreſſions: we confeſs the Deciſion of ſome exterior Rituals in Worſhip is left to civil Cuſtom: and others to Divine Authority: but that the Deciſion of any Rituals in Worſhip is left to Church Cuſtom, where the Thing hath no Decencie but in Religion; or to Humane Authority: this is what we Queſtion; and he ſhould Prove. He ſpeaketh, *p.* 153. of *Rites in the Worſhip of GOD (among the Jews) that were only Significations of Reverence and Uniformity which were ſtill retained, as they were tranſmitted to them by Patriarchal Cuſtom, and Traditions, though only founded on Humane Appointment.* But he hath not thought fit to give us any one Inſtance of ſuch Rites. If he mean Religious Ceremonies; that is, Actions peculiar to Worſhip, I think he can give no Inſtance of ſuch in the Jewiſh Church, before its great Apoſtacie, except theſe that were Inſtituted by GOD, and taught in the Law of *Moſes.*

§. 5. He cometh next, *p.* 154. to renew the Arguments he had managed in his *Apology, p.* 155. *&c.* and were Anſwered, *Def. of Vindic. p.* 38. He telleth us of a *General Medium* he had uſed, *that there are ſeveral ſignificant Ceremonies mentioned in, and alluded to in the Scripture, which were Practiſed in the Worſhip of GOD under the Patriarchal, Jewiſh, and Chriſtian Æconomie, which had no other than Humane Appointment.* The *firſt* Inſtance he giveth is, *Diſcalceation, Exod.* 13. 5. He had in his *Apology*, joyned with this, *looking to our Feet when we go to the Houſe of GOD; Eccleſ.* 5. 1. But he hath now wiſely left out this laſt: and Inſiſteth only on *Diſcalceation.* What was Objected here, with ſome freedom, that was *bad Logick*, he repreſenteth as reflecting on *Mr. Mede*, who diſcourſeth of that Obſervation among the Eaſtern-Nations. I have as high Eſteem of *Mr. Medes* Learning as he hath; and have ſaid nothing that

can import the Contrarie. The Answer given to this Instance, was, *this was Commanded of GOD; and so is no Argument for Observing what is brought into the Worship of GOD merely by the Authority of Man.* All the Reply that he bringeth is, that *this Command was no new Institution of a Ceremonie*, whereas he saith, *what GOD said to Moses was only an Advertisement to Observe a Custom that he knew to be used in the Eastern-Nations; so that bad Moses put off his Shoes before that Advertisement, he had done nothing amiss: and so this is a strong Confirmation of Ceremonies that express our Reverence though founded on Humane Appointment.* Here I remark. 1. Whether this was a *new Institution* of a Ceremonie or not, is not to our Purpose: *Moses* had express Divine Warrant for what he did: if he can shew the like for our Ceremonies we shall Observe them. The LORD might Enjoyn what he would, either for that time, or for perpetual Observation: either what was used among the Nations; or what was not so used: Let us see an Approbation of any of our Ceremonies that is Paralel to this, and we shall lay our Hand on our Mouth. 2. It is evident that this was a Civil Custom, and made expressive of Reverence by that Civil Custom; and therefore, the LORD is not here either Instituting, or Approving, a Religious Ceremonie, but requiring to express profound Reverence in the Ordinarie way, and that on such an Extraordinarie Occasion. *Corn. a lapide*; saith, *Minus enim audacter & curiose accesserat Moses.* That this was a Civil Custom, and had its Signification, not from Man's Authority Appropriating it to GOD'S Worship (which is the Foundation of the Ceremonies we Debate about) is clear from Mr, Mede, and what my Antagonist bringeth out of him. Also, the same Learned School-Man (I mean *A Lapide*) saith, *his ritus a mancipiis descendit, qui nudis pedibus incedebant, in signum subjectionis*, and therefore he Paraphraseth that Text, *Exod.* 3. 5. *ut totus in Dei jus & obsequium transeas.* It is Observed by *Ainsworth* on the same Text, that *this was a Civil Sign of transferring our Right to another*, Deut. 25. 9. *Ruth* 4. 7. It was also by Civil Custom, an Expression of Sorrow. 2 *Sam.* 15. 30. *Isai.* 20. 2, 4. *Ezek.* 24. 17, 23. Now, if he can shew that the Ceremonies have, by Civil Custom, such aptitude to Signifie what we ought to express in the Worship of GOD, we shall not Oppose them. It is, 3. Evident from his own Words, *p.* 55. where to my Question, *why do not they Observe it, if it be a fit Ceremonie to express our Reverence in Worship*; he Answereth; *what is so Expressive in one Age or Countrey may be not so in another.* Surely this Change can only come from Civil Custom: what is peculiar

to

to Religion is the ſame every where. If then this Action was brought into Religion by the Significancie and Aptitude it had been got by Civil Cuſtom, it is no Præcedent for ſuch Ceremonies as that cannot be Pleaded for.

§ 6. Another Inſtance he had brought was, *Sackcloth and Aſhes*, as ſignifying grief and ſorrow in their Solemn Humiliation; To theſe 2 Things were Anſwered; The One, *Why do not the Prelatiſts uſe theſe?* This he Rejecteth, as *unparalelled Nonſenſe*; becauſe, *if they were ſtill in uſe in our Countrey who would refuſe them that was not reſolved to be ſingular. A.* I ſhould be none of theſe ſingular Perſons: If they had now Significancie by civil Cuſtom: I ſhould be willing that they ſhould be uſed in Religion, when Humiliation and Sorrow were Solemnly to be expreſt: but when they want that, I think our Brethren do well not to uſe them in Religion. Yet I muſt ſay ſtill, that if they were Religious Ceremonies of Old; that is peculiar to Religion; they ſhould be ſtill uſed without any Dependence on the civil Cuſtom of our Time. I ſee not what *Nonſenſe* is in this. If he did not look on them as Religious Ceremonies, but only as uſed in Religion from their Signification that they had by Civil uſe; the *Nonſenſe* was in bringing this as an Inſtance of Religious Ceremonies of Humane Appointment, for they had no Authority but from Men; therefore they never were, nor now ſhould be, Religious Ceremonies. His next Inſtance is (as he ſaith) *ad hominem. Lifting up the right hand to Heaven, in Swearing the Covenant.* It was Anſwered, that *this Rite, not only hath Warrant from Scripture Example, but is the Civil Cuſtom of the Nation, the like cannot be ſaid of the Controverted Ceremonies.* His Reply is, *a Ceremonie being mentioned in Scripture maketh it not only allowable; but ſheweth, that it was in it ſelf, before Lawful and decent. And it is Lawful to us, on the ſame Reaſons that made it Lawful to them who firſt Practiſed it.* In Purſuance of this his Reply, he allegeth, that *we hereby Grant, that many ſuch Uſages are alluded to in Scripture, which are merely of Humane Appointment, and yet Deny their Lawfulneſs; which is to make all Men that Lived before us to be Sottiſhly Superſtitious.* To this Purpoſe he Diſcourſeth, *p.* 158. 159. Let it be Conſidered that we do not make bare Alluſion made in Scripture to any Uſage, to be a ſufficient Proof of its Lawfulneſs: for ſome were Alluded to that were very far from being Lawful: Inſtances may be given of *putting the Branch to the Noſe, kiſſing the Hand, or kiſſing the Images* that they worſhiped, which (and many more) were Practiſed by Idolaters. Our Opini-

on in this Matter is, that what Rites are mentioned in Scripture, as uſed in the Worſhip of the True GOD, by His People, and are not any where Condemned, we ought to look on as Lawful, and Approved of GOD, that is, as they then were uſed. Now ſome of theſe Rites were of Divine Inſtitution, as all the Jewiſh Ceremonies Enjoyned by *Moſes*: theſe were then Lawful, but now are not ſo; becauſe they are Abrogated by CHRIST; alſo all theſe Inſtituted by CHRIST are ſtill Lawful. Others of them are Natural Expreſſions of the Acting of the Mind: ſuch as *Sighing*, *lifting the Eyes*, &c. theſe are always Lawful: others of them were Civil Cuſtoms, which by Uſe acquired a Significancie, and fitneſs to expreſs our Affections that we ſhould have in Religious Worſhip; ſuch as *Sackcloth*, *renting our Cloaths*, *Incurvation*, &c. theſe are certainly Lawful to be uſed in Worſhip, when, and where they have that Significancie, by the Force of Civil Cuſtom; but in Times and Places where that Significancie is not, the Ground of it being ceaſed, I ſee not how they can be Eſteemed Lawful, having, then, and there, no Uſe or Significancie in GOD'S Worſhip; but what they have from Man's will, which ought not to Regulate GOD'S Worſhip. Our Author Miſtaketh when he ſaith, *that we think ſome Ceremonies Lawful which are mentioned, or alluded to in Scripture, though they had no other Original than Humane Appointment:* this we Diſown: for none of theſe *Three* ways by which Rites get their Significancie (which I have now mentioned) can be juſtly called Humane Appointment: Civil Cuſtom is that which cometh neareſt to it, but yet Differeth far from it: for Humane Appointment is an Act of Authority, *i. e.* a Law, or Injunction, or Declaration of the Will of one, or more Men, expreſly Concluding that ſo it ſhall be: Cuſtom is a Tacite Conſent of People, whether Great or Small, whether Placed in Authority, or not; in uſing ſuch an Action, or Word, for ſuch an End, or Signification. I ſhall not Debate, what Men in Authority may do, toward putting a Civil Signification on Words and Actions, and making them Current in Civil Solemnities: but I Maintain that they cannot give a Religious Signification or Uſe to any Word, or Action, or Geſture: that is, they cannot Appoint it to be uſed ſo in Religion, when it hath no Aptitude for that Uſe or Significancie from its Common Uſe in other things: for this were to Diſpoſe of the External Worſhip of GOD at their will.

§ 7. For

§ 7. For the Rite of *Lifting up the Hand*, ſo often mentioned in Scripture, as Practiſed by good Men, by good Angels: yea, by God Himſelf, (ſpeaking of Him after the Manner of Men) that it had its Original from Humane Appointment, is ſimply denyed. We have no Footſteps of ſuch a Law, Antecedent to the Practice of it, either in Sacred, or other Records. I may with Confidence conclude, that this Uſage had its Original, if not from Nature, as Lifting up of the Eyes to Heaven, yet from an Univerſal Cuſtom, and that of all, or many Nations. It is true, other Rites were alſo uſed in Swearing; but none of them ſo frequently mentioned as this. Wherefore it can be no Precedent for, nor give any Countenance to, Ceremonies peculiar to the Worſhip of God brought into it by the Authority and Appointment of Men alone. It is hence evident, that we are not guilty of *counting all them Sottiſhly Superſtitious*, who uſed ſuch Rites, and that even in Religion, tho we think Humane Religious Ceremonies unlawful. Our Author, *p.* 159. is pleaſed to make himſelf Merry with the Diſtinction I have uſed of Civil Rites, (which he, with little Accuracy of Speech, calleth Civil Ceremonies) and Religious Ceremonies; that the one may be uſed in Religion, without Divine Inſtitution; the other not ſo. He calleth it *a Metaphyſical Diſtinction; and new Philoſophy; and Co-æval with Presbytery in its laſt Figure.* Theſe Sarcaſms are the Tokens of his Surprize, and Admiration; not of his being much Converſant with their Writings who Treat of this Subject. Let us hear his Thundering Arguments after theſe *ſilly Squibs*. *If the Civil Authority can introduce a Significant Ceremony into the Worſhip of God, why may not the Eccleſiaſtick Authority do it? A.* He will not underſtand what we ſay: we deny that Civil Authority can introduce a Significant Ceremony into the Worſhip of God; tho Civil Cuſtom may make a Rite fit to be there uſed. If the Magiſtrat ſhould appoint any Habite or Geſture to be uſed in Gods Worſhip, to ſignifie either Gods Will toward us, or our Duty to Him; which hath no ſuch Signification, nor Uſe, but by the Law, or Will of the Magiſtrat, we ſhould diſowne ſuch a Religious Ceremony, as much in that Caſe, as if it were appointed by Church Authority. But it is a quite other Caſe; when an Action, or Geſture, hath got a Signification by long and general Uſe in Mens other Actions; ſo as that they are thereby made ſignificant of what we are to expreſs in Worſhip. This may be cleared by a parallel Inſtance: Words which have got their Signification by Uſe in other Things, may be well uſed in Religion: yet it doth

on in this Matter is, that what Rites are mentioned in Scripture, as used in the Worship of the True GOD, by His People, and are not any where Condemned, we ought to look on as Lawful, and Approved of GOD, that is, as they then were used. Now some of these Rites were of Divine Institution, as all the Jewish Ceremonies Enjoyned by *Moses*: these were then Lawful, but now are not so; because they are Abrogated by CHRIST; also all these Instituted by CHRIST are still Lawful. Others of them are Natural Expressions of the Acting of the Mind: such as *Sighing, lifting the Eyes*, &c. these are always Lawful: others of them were Civil Customs, which by Use acquired a Significancie, and fitness to express our Affections that we should have in Religious Worship; such as *Sackcloth, renting our Cloaths, Incurvation*, &c. these are certainly Lawful to be used in Worship, when, and where they have that Significancie, by the Force of Civil Custom; but in Times and Places where that Significancie is not, the Ground of it being ceased, I see not how they can be Esteemed Lawful, having, then, and there, no Use or Significancie in GOD'S Worship; but what they have from Man's will, which ought not to Regulate GOD'S Worship. Our Author Mistaketh when he saith, *that we think some Ceremonies Lawful which are mentioned, or alluded to in Scripture, though they had no other Original than Humane Appointment:* this we Disown: for none of these *Three* ways by which Rites get their Significancie (which I have now mentioned) can be justly called Humane Appointment: Civil Custom is that which cometh nearest to it, but yet Differeth far from it: for Humane Appointment is an Act of Authority, *i. e.* a Law, or Injunction, or Declaration of the Will of one, or more Men, expressly Concluding that so it shall be: Custom is a Tacite Consent of People, whether Great or Small, whether Placed in Authority, or not; in using such an Action, or Word, for such an End, or Signification. I shall not Debate, what Men in Authority may do, toward putting a Civil Signification on Words and Actions, and making them Current in Civil Selemnities: but I Maintain that they cannot give a Religious Signification or Use to any Word, or Action, or Gesture: that is, they cannot Appoint it to be used so in Religion, when it hath no Aptitude for that Use or Significancie from its Common Use in other things: for this were to Dispose of the External Worship of GOD at their will.

§ 7. For

§ 7. For the Rite of *Lifting up the Hand*, ſo often mentioned in Scripture, as Practiſed by good Men, by good Angels: yea, by God Himſelf, (ſpeaking of Him after the Manner of Men) that it had its Original from Humane Appointment, is ſimply denyed. We have no Footſteps of ſuch a Law, Antecedent to the Practice of it, either in Sacred, or other Records. I may with Confidence conclude, that this Uſage had its Original, if not from Nature, as Lifting up of the Eyes to Heaven, yet from an Univerſal Cuſtom, and that of all, or many Nations. It is true, other Rites were alſo uſed in Swearing; but none of them ſo frequently mentioned as this. Wherefore it can be no Precedent for, nor give any Countenance to, Ceremonies peculiar to the Worſhip of God brought into it by the Authority and Appointment of Men alone. It is hence evident, that we are not guilty of *counting all them Sottiſhly Superſtitious*, who uſed ſuch Rites, and that even in Religion, tho we think Humane Religious Ceremonies unlawful. Our Author, *p.* 159. is pleaſed to make himſelf Merry with the Diſtinction I have uſed of Civil Rites, (which he, with little Accuracy of Speech, calleth Civil Ceremonies) and Religious Ceremonies; that the one may be uſed in Religion, without Divine Inſtitution; the other not ſo. He calleth it *a Metaphyſical Diſtinction; and new Phyloſophy; and Co-æval with Presbytery in its laſt Figure.* Theſe Sarcaſms are the Tokens of his Surprize, and Admiration; not of his being much Converſant with their Writings who Treat of this Subject. Let us hear his Thundering Arguments after theſe *ſilly Squibs*. *If the Civil Authority can introduce a Significant Ceremony into the Worſhip of God, why may not the Eccleſiaſtick Authority do it? A.* He will not underſtand what we ſay: we deny that Civil Authority can introduce a Significant Ceremony into the Worſhip of God; tho Civil Cuſtom may make a Rite fit to be there uſed. If the Magiſtrat ſhould appoint any Habite or Geſture to be uſed in Gods Worſhip, to ſignifie either Gods Will toward us, or our Duty to Him; which hath no ſuch Signification, nor Uſe, but by the Law, or Will of the Magiſtrat, we ſhould diſowne ſuch a Religious Ceremony, as much in that Caſe, as if it were appointed by Church Authority. But it is a quite other Caſe; when an Action, or Geſture, hath got a Signification by long and general Uſe in Mens other Actions; ſo as that they are thereby made ſignificant of what we are to expreſs in Worſhip. This may be cleared by a parallel Inſtance: Words which have got their Signification by Uſe in other Things, may be well uſed in Religion: yet it doth

doth not thence follow, that the Magiſtrate may enjoyn Words to be uſed in our Worſhipping of God, which have no Signification, but from his Will: for if this were allowed, the Magiſtrate might not only enjoyn Latine Service, to be uſed among a People that underſtand not that Language; but might enjoyn Words that now ſignifie Error, or Blaſphemy: and give them an Orthodox Signification: which I hope our Brethren will not affirm. If Men may enjoyn a *Surplice*, becauſe white Garments, in ſome Ages, and Places, were uſed commonly to ſignifie Purity or Gladneſs: why may he not enjoyn the Language to be uſed in Religion, that our Anceſtors uſed many Hundreds of Years ago; tho it may be now neither uſed nor underſtood: it would come, in Time, to be as Significant to us, and as Religious, as now the *Surplice* is, where it hath been long uſed. He Miſtaketh, or Miſinterpreteth the *Vindicator*, when he ſaith, that *he alloweth of Civil Ceremonies in the Worſhip of God*; he owneth no ſuch Ceremonies, if we ſpeak properly: what hath its Uſe and Significancy from Civil Cuſtom in other Actions is no Ceremony; it is a Civil Rite, and may well be uſed in Religion: he repeateth alſo his former Miſtake: as if we thought that *Civil Authority might appoint Ceremonies for Religion, but not Church Authority*: our Opinion in which, I have made plain to them who will underſtand what we ſay. I have alſo Anſwered his Queſtion, *how the Civil Rite uſed in Religion is Innocent, while a Religious Ceremony, appropriated to Religion, if it be of Humane Appointment* (whether by the Authority of Church or State) *is not ſo.* I deny what he ſo confidently aſſerteth, *p.* 261. that *Lifting up the Hand in Swearing, is of Humane Appointment*: neither is his Proof of it ſufficient, *viz.* that *it hath no Divine Inſtitution*: for what is brought in, and gets its Uſe, and Significany, by Civil Cuſtom; is a Middle between theſe. 2. I am not at Leaſure to repeat my Anſwer, as often as he doth his Objection taken from the Equality of the Civil and Eccleſiaſtick Authority to inſtitute Ceremonies; with which he filleth ſeveral Pages, with a nauſeous ſaying the ſame thing, in Words little different. *The Immemorial Poſſeſſion of any Rite in the Church* (which he inſinuateth as an Argument) cannot juſtifie it, if it be appropriated to Religion, and had no Divine Original. We are not concerned to account for *Kiſſing the Evangel* in taking an Oath; whether it came in by Civil Cuſtom, or Eccleſiaſtick Authority. Let them who uſe it Anſwer ſuch Doubts: or rather, let them ſhew us any Ground for it from Nature, from Civil Cuſtom, or from Divine Inſtitution: if it be deſti-

tute

tute of all these, he should prove, not barely assert the Stubbornness that is in Refusing it. It is absurd to say, that *the Ecclesiastical Ceremonies having the Civil Sanction, are, under that* Reduplication, *to be looked upon as Civil Ceremonies*: for he might say the same of the Sacraments of the New Testament, when enjoyned by Law: it is not the Civil Authority, but Rites being used in Civil Actions, and not being peculiar to the the Worship of God; it is their having their Use and Significancy from Civil Custom, that giveth them that Denomination.

§ 8. He Starteth a Scruple, *p.* 263. which hath no Rise from what any of his Adversaries had ever said; nor any where else, that I know, but in his Imagination. It is, *If a Ceremony have one Signification in Civil Actions, and another in Religious Worship; Quæritur, Whether it maketh it lawful in Worship? A.* No. Because its Lawfulness is founded on the Significancy that it acquireth in Civil Actions. I gladly would know what Ground was ever given him to say so confidently as he doth, that *we hold that a Ceremony is lawful in Religion, if it hath been used in Civil Solemnities, tho in a different* Signification. If he find any Body asserting that, let him call such Persons *Absurd, Ridiculous, Foolish, &c.* at his Pleasure; as he very freely calleth us, on that Imaginary Account: but if no such thing have ever been held by any of us, I shall give him no Epithet, but leave it to the Reader to call him as he deserveth. He hath another Argument for the Lawfulness of Humane Ceremonies peculiar to Religion; which he Ushereth in with that Degree of Confidence, and Insolent Contempt of his Adversaries, that might Fright us into Silence, as the Lion by his Roaring Terrifieth his Prey into a Consternation; calling all our Exceptions against Significant Ceremonies in the Worship of God, *little* and *idle frivolous Impertinencies.* And no wonder he be so fond of his mighty Argument; I believe it is the Birth of his own Brain. I never met with it before: and I have seen few that are of less weight. It is that the Apostle, *Rom.* 6. 4. *maketh a palpable Allusion to the Significant Ceremony of Immersion; when he saith we are Buried with Him by Baptism into Death, &c.* To strengthen this Argument, he telleth us of *Immersion being used by Jews, and by Christians*; that *it is founded on no Divine Institution: but on the Practice of the Jewish Church, and thence derived to Christians; and was never established by any other Authority, but what was purely Humane and Ecclesiastical.* He telleth us *this Custom was so known, that all their Learned Neighbours were acquaint with it*; and for this he very wisely citeth *Tacitus hist. lib.* 5. speaking

of

of their Circumcision, but not one Word of *Immersion*. He calleth for *the particular Text where this Ceremony is founded on expres's Institution*; also that we should *shew where it was used in Civil Actions*: That *Scripture Example for it, is but the Consequence of its being Practised; and supposeth it.* At last, to make all sure, he condescendeth to the *Jargon of the Schools* (with which this Soaring Eagle, thinks we Poor Worms are only acquainted) that is to put his Argument into Logical Form and Figure; thus: *a Significant Ceremony founded upon no Divine Institution, and alluded to in Saint Pauls Reasonings, Rom. 6. 4. is lawful in it self. But the Ceremony of Immersion, in the Administration of Baptism was founded on no Divine Institution, and yet alluded to by Saint Paul, is a thing received in the current Practice of the Apostolical Church, Ergo, such a Significant Ceremony in the Worship of God, founded on no Divine Institution, is in it self lawful.* I shall far more easily dispatch this Argument, than he hath framed it. If it were not to Hazard his further Despising us, as Conversant only with the *School Jargon* of Syllogising: I should observe that he flyeth so high, as to take little notice of Syllogistical Form, for all his pretending to it: for the Major Proposition is the very Conclusion of the Syllogism, only he hath altered the Word, putting such a Significant Ceremony, for a Significant Ceremony alluded to by the Apostle *Paul*: other Informalities in it I pass: it is below him to mind them: *Aquila non captat Muscas.* For a more material Answer, I first deny the Major, as thus universally proposed: Allusion to a Ceremony is no Proof of its Lawfulness: as I have proved §. 6. Next, I deny the Minor: I affirm that *Immersion* was founded on Divine Institution: which I prove, 1. Because it is here mentioned, as the lawful and approved Way of Administration of Baptism: which Ordinance Christ had appointed: it were a strange Fancy to think that Christ had enjoyned baptism, and not told them who were to Administer it, what He meant by it, or what they should do. Next, Whereas he demandeth a particular Scripture for its Institution, (tho we be not obliged to that Exactness, yet) I adduce *Matth.* 28. 19. where Baptizing is Commanded: every one knoweth that βαπτίζω signifieth properly to *Dip*, or *Plunge in Water*: and that it is taken more largely for any Kind of Washing, or Rinsing, as *Mark* 7. 4. it is not to be thought, that when ever the Jews came from the Mercat, they Plunged themselves over Head and Ears in Water, *Act.* 1. 15. the Spirits Cleansing the Soul is expressed by that Word, so *Act.* 11. 16. 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. Hence it plainly followeth, that Christ enjoyneth

enjoyneth a Sacramental Uſe of Water in Baptiſm, for a Myſtical Waſhing; and the Word being of ſo large a Signification; and Chriſt not having determined how much Water ſhould be uſed in Baptiſm: whether the Body ſhould be wholly Dipt, or a part of it, or Water ſhould be Thrown, or Sprinkled on the Body; or what Quantity ſhould be Caſt on: that all theſe ways of Waſhing have Divine Warrant: and tho none of them be enjoyned excluſively of another; yet every one of them hath Chriſts Warrant: the Conſequence of which is, that this Dipping is no Humane Ceremony, eſpecially conſidering, that every one of theſe ways of Baptizing, hath a Myſtical Signification put on it, even in the Scripture: Dipping in the Text that he citeth; and Sprinkling and Rinſing in the Old Teſtament, ſee *Ezek*, 36. 25. And this will be yet further confirmed, if we conſider, that Chriſt Teacheth, that however applying Water to the whole Body may be a fit, and allowable Ceremony to expreſs Spiritual Waſhing; yet that is not neceſſary; but a little may be as effectual for that Myſtical Uſe, as the whole: *Joh.* 13. 10. What I have ſaid precludeth the Objection, that Chriſt maketh the three ways of Baptizing only lawful, and alloweth the Church to determine which of them ought to be uſed: for the general Word implyeth a Disjunctive Command; neither is it in the Power of the Church to determine one way, excluſive of another: nor ſhould different Practices in this Caſe be Cenſured, as receding from Inſtitution; each of theſe ways is a Mode of Baptizing, which is within the Compaſs of Chriſts Inſtitution.

§ 9. That this *Immerſion* was uſed in the Jewiſh Church, (yea, it may be proved to have been uſed among Heathens alſo) is no Proof that it is not of Divine Inſtitution, as it is uſed in the Chriſtian Church; for the ſame may be ſaid of Baptiſm, which Chriſt made a Sacrament. Neither doth its Myſtical Signification make it to be a Humane Ceremony; ſeing it hath that from Chriſts Inſtitution: nor doth that make it ſo neceſſary, as to exclude all other Modes of Baptizing; ſeing other ways have their Myſtical Significancy, as hath been ſhewed: yea, Caſting Water on the Perſon may aptly ſignifie the ſame with Dipping, *viz.* being *buried with Chriſt*, a part of the Body under the Water, may ſignifie the being under it, as *Waſhing the Feet* ſignifieth Waſhing the whole Body, *Joh.* 13. 10. He inferreth, *p.* 268. that *the Power of Rituals is ſtill lodged in the Church, which ſhe may vary and alter, to ſerve the Ends of Edification.* This is a moſt abſurd Conſequence: for, 1.

He doth not here distinguish Rituals, nor exclude these of Divine Institution; but layeth them, in the Bulk, open to the Arbitriment of the Bishops; if they think it for Edification, they may dispose, even of the Sacraments as they will: for these also come under the general Head of Rituals. 2. It no way followeth, the Lord hath left some Circumstances of his Worship undetermined, and variable: *Ergo*, he hath left the Power of Rituals to the Church. For the *Immersion* he speaketh of, is no more than a Circumstance of Baptism, *viz.* what Quantity of Water should be used, and to how much of the Body it must be applyed: this is left variable: it doth not thence follow, that the Church may bring in new Rites, that have no Foundation in the Word; as for Example, *the Sign of the Cross*. He telleth us, *p.* 271. of *the Protestants abroad, who have furthest receded from the Practice of the Roman Church; that they never thought a Significant Ceremony in the Worship of God, was in it self Superstitious and Unlawful.* And we in this agree with them. I have already often told him, what Ceremonies we owne, and what we reject. He instanceth in the *Waldenses* retaining the *trina immersio*, and the *trine Fraction* of the Bread in the Eucharist. We never thought the *Waldenses* perfect: tho it is very evident to all who know any thing of that History, that they were far from using the Ceremonies used in the Episcopal Church, and that they condemned them generally: and that the Simplicity of the Apostolick Church was very much imitated by them.

§ 10. Another Debate he commenceth, *p.* 272. about *the Episcopal Church of England not admitting any to Labour in the Work of the Ministry among them, tho they had been Ordained by Laying on the Hands of the Presbytery, unless they will submit to be Re-ordained by a Bishop*: which he very slightly passeth over: taking no notice of what had been said against that Practice: only he telleth us what *Solæcisms he could pick out of my Book*, even *more than a hundred*: but is content with one Instance in the Title Page; *the Apology of the Clergy*; in stead of, *for the Clergy*: he is very Charitable who overlooketh; and hideth the Shame of more than a hundred Solæcisms, and cometh over this Passage now the second time, which is no Solæcism at all. What followeth is yet more frivolous, and is designed to Reflect on a Person of more Worth than I am, who had said, that *he had paid Material Canonical Obedience to the Bishop; but not formally*; by which he meant no more, but that he had performed the Duty of his Ministerial Office, when the Bishops enjoyned it, which

which he, would have done without it. And now, if that Assertion do not please our Author, he denyeth he payed Canonical Obedience at all. Also this is a false Accusation, and though this Author was challenged oft about his false Assertions against this Minister; yet he had never the Confidence to Answer one of them, nor to Vindicat himself from being a false Accuser, but made a silly Quible on that Expression; which he doth here again repeat, which needs no other Answer then the repeating that Reverend Brother's Words, which our Author carpeth at, as they may be seen in the *Postscript to the second Vindication of the Church*, p. 200. His Words are these, *Thinking my self free to joyn in these Duties to which I was Authorized by my Office, altho there had been no Bishop in the World; nor do I think that by this I payed Formal Canonical Obedience*; so that the asserting of this, may be accounted a thirteenth of our Authors Lies. I am no further concerned to take notice of his Discourse on this Head. He returneth now, p. 275. to resume the Matter about Presbyterian Ordination, and only telleth us that *he will wave it, and will not tell us his Opinion about it*: after he had been pretty plain in the Matter, in his former Book: it is Wisdom to medle no further in a Matter that hath been made to appear to be Indefensible: yet he will not dismiss this Subject, without a parting Blow to the Ordination of the later *Scots* Presbyterians: which he saith, p. 277. *is left naked, and destitute of all such Arguments, as might excuse the Ordination of other Forreign Churches*. And he doth more than insinuate that Presbyterians have no Ordination. His Arguments (so far as I can pick them out of his Discourse) are, 1. *They were under no necessity to separate from their Bishops in the Isle of Britain*, *A.* 1. Want of Bishops might be the same Excuse for the want of Episcopal Ordination, that it was to other Protestant Churches for whom he pleadeth it: they might have had Bishops if they would, in *France*, *Geneva*, *Switzerland*, *&c.*, as well as we might. 2. The Necessity lay in this, that we thought, (and still must think, till he, or some else, instruct us better) that Bishops ought not to be in the Church. 3. He speaketh of *separating from our Bishops in the Isle of Britain*: that plainly insinuateth, that not only the Bishops in the Churuh of *Scotland* are ours, but the Bishops of *England* also, and that we are under their Jurisdiction; as some of them have pleaded: this, from a Minister of the Church of *Scotland*, is Unworthy Flattery of that Clergy that he now dependeth on for his Bread. 3. If Ministers in *Scotland* have no Ordination, because, in want of Bishops

among themſelves, they went not to the *Engliſh* Biſhops for Ordination, why is not the ſame Defectiveneſs imputed to theſe in *France*, who might have come over to *England* for the ſame End. But the *Scots* Presbyterians are the Men of his Indignation: and therefore, any Weapon that cometh to Hand, muſt be uſed to beat them down. Before I leave this Point, I ſhall make it evident that the other Reformed, who are without Biſhops, can no more have a lawful Ordination than *Scotland* hath, 1. Becauſe they might have had Biſhops to rule them; for what could hinder them? their Magiſtrats did not; for they are of Opinion with themſelves: except in *France*, where the Popiſh Magiſtrats did not, nor would oppoſe that piece of Conformity with themſelves. Yea, *Thuan.* blameth the Proteſtants for not ſetting up Biſhops: the Primitive Church under Heathen Magiſtrats, had Biſhops in our Authors Opinion: and we think they wanted no needful Church Officer, even in that State. 2. It is plain that the Reformed were againſt Epiſcopacy, as no Ordinance of Chriſt, as I have ſhewed: and it is evident from Confeſſion of the *French* Church, *Art.* 30. and of the *Belgick*, *Art.* 31. which being read in the Synod of *Dort*, was not diſliked by any of the *Externi*, ſave theſe from *England*.

§ 11. His ſecond Argument that the *Scots* Presbyterians have no Ordination is, *It is very uncertain, whether they retain ſuch Solemn and Formal Words, when they impoſe Hands, as expreſly declare, that the Prieſtly Power of Adminiſtrating Sacraments, and Abſolving Pœnitents, is then Conveyed to him that is Ordained. If there be no ſuch Conveyance, there is no Ordination; and if the Words made uſe of, doth not plainly and formally ſignifie ſuch a Power, then there is no ſuch Power Conveyed.* A. This Uncertainty can be no good *Medium* to prove his Point. For ſuch Words may really be uſed, tho both he and I be uncertain, whether they were uſed or not. Again; how can he prove the neceſſity of ſuch Words: what if Words be made uſe of, which do really and materially ſignifie the thing deſigned; tho they do it not formally and plainly? He is the firſt that I have met with, who layeth ſo much weight on *the Form of Words*. It is one of the *new Opinions* he hath broached, while he pretendeth to refute *new Opinions*. Againſt it I thus argue, 1. No Words are enjoyned in Scripture: which muſt needs have been, if the Nullity of Ordination, and conſequently of the Ordinances Adminiſtred by ſuch Miniſters, had been the neceſſary Conſequent of Words not ſufficiently formal and plain. What a ſad Uncertainty and Confuſion ſhould follow on this Neceſſity

Neceſſity of ſuch Words? not unlike that which, in the *Popiſh* Church, followeth on the Opinion of the Neceſſity of the Prieſts Intention in his Adminiſtrations. 1. Can he tell us what Form of Words the Apoſtles uſed, when they Ordained Miniſters; how plain and formal they were? if Uncertainty about that Nullify the *Scots* Presbyterian Ordination, it will by good Conſequence, make void all the Ordinations of the Apoſtolick Church: I am ſure he can give us no Accouut of their Words from any Authentick Records. 3. In the Adminiſtration of Baptiſm, no Church that I know of, uſeth Formal and plain Words that expreſs either Admiſſion into the Church, or Communication of Chriſtian Priviledges, or Covenanting with GOD, or our Renouncing the Devil, *&c.* I am ſure *I Baptiſe thee in the Name of the Father*, &c. are not Formal, plain Words, to expreſs theſe Things; tho I doubt not but that they Include them all: and if Baptiſm be valid without ſuch a Form of Words, why not Ordination alſo? He ſays, *p.* 278. that *there are many of their Number in the Weſt, who think Impoſition of Hands unneceſſarie.* I ſuppoſe he hath no Perſonal knowledge of this: and he ſhould be ſure of his Informers before he caſt ſuch a Reproach on his Brethren: for my part, I know no Miniſter in *Scotland*, *Weſt*, *Eaſt*, *South*, or *North*, who profeſſeth that Opinion: tho mean while I can tell him of others who are not far from it: even the Church of *France*, in their Synod, at *Paris* 1565. *C.* 6. *Quick. Synod. p.* 62. but I far rather agree with Mr. *Firmin*, who hath Written a Treatiſe to prove the Neceſſity of it. He inferreth likewiſe, *p.* 279. from what he had Diſcourſed, that *we have no Organical Church*. We are not afraid of his Cenſures: we can Prove, not only that we have the Eſſentials of Ordination; but that, for the Manner of it, it is nearer to the Goſpel Pattern than what is Practiſed in that Church which he owneth. I find him to be of the ſame Sentiments with that Biſhop in *England* that was mentioned to him, who ſaid of a Presbyterian Miniſter that *he was no better than a Mechanick*, tho he had never been Bred to any Art but the Liberal Arts, and had Presbyterial Ordination. It is ſtrange that he ſhould Inſinuate, that *we derive our Power from the People*: he cannot but know that we Diſown that Principle: but *Calumniare audaĉter, aliquid adhærebit*: he hopeth that ſome will believe what ever evil he ſaith of us.

§. 12. His next Controverſie is about the *Presbyterian Church Diſcipline*: which he had moſt Abuſivly and falſly Reproached, *Apolog. p.* 22, 23. and

and was Checkt for ſo doing by a Modeſt Anſwer, *Def. Vindic. p.* 17, In which that which is moſt Material he wholly paſſeth over: bringing ſome what like an Anſwer to *Two* or *Three* Things. It was asked. *what is that Diſcipline of the Antient Church (which he wiſheth were Re-ſtored) which is not either the ſame with ours, or far more ſtrict and Severe,* He Anſwereth that *he never found fault with our Diſcipline for its being ſtrict; but for being factiouſly Pragmatical, and endleſly Inquiſitive, and from its having no Tendency to Edifie the Chriſtian-Church, or to Reclaim wicked People.* What can an unbyaſſed Reader underſtand by theſe Words, but that the Man is angry, and hateth the Presbyterians, and their Way: and would fain caſt Dirt on them, if he could find it. Theſe indefinite and groſs Accuſations muſt either be Proved, that thus the Presbyterians do Manage the Diſcipline of the Church; and this muſt be in many Inſtances, and many Miniſters and Elders; and all this well Atteſted: or the Man who thus Writeth muſt paſs for a *Slanderer*, rather than a *Diſputant*. Our Diſcipline we Manage by the Rules of the Word, and the Principles of ſound Reaſon; we do not Indulge Sin in theſe of our own Way; nor medle with Things that are without our Line: nor do we enquire into Scandalous Sins till they become ſuch, by being openly known: and if Occaſion be given for Enquirie, and nothing be found, we Deſiſt, and leave Secret Things to GOD, to whom they belong; for the Tendency of our Exerciſe of Diſcipline, we are ſure it is for Edification; and we can make it appear that ſometimes it is Bleſſed with Succeſs; and if it Irritate ſome, or Harden others, or have no Fruit on many, we Lament it: but are not to be blamed for it; for the ſame Thing may be ſaid of Preaching the Goſpel, and that in a Commendable manner. I Deny not but that ſome are ſhort of that Dexterity that others have; and that there is Imperfection in the beſt of us: and if they that blame us can ſay otherways of their own Church, either they are ſtrangly Deluded, or the World is generally Deceived about their Way. He commenceth a new Debate, *p.* 283. about *Non-reſiſtance* which he had raiſed, *Apolog. p.* 20. and yet waved, and of which very little was ſaid, *Def. of Vindic. p.* 16. he now reſumeth the Debate, and talketh more freely than before; being behind the Curtain, and not in Hazard of Cenſure. I was then unwilling, and am ſtill more ſo, to medle in that Matter; both becauſe it is a Controuerſie that belongeth to the Politicks rather than to Divinity; and Lawyers are fitteſt to Mannage it. Alſo, becauſe it is not now between *Prelatiſts* and *Presbyterians*: the Generality of

of both having of late years Agreed in what is Inconsistent with the Prelatical Doctrine that was Current some years ago.

§ 13. Another of our new *Opinions* he will have to be, *p.* 289. that *they* (the Presbyterians) *abhorre and cast off all Established Forms and Rules in the Worship of GOD*, &c. we have under this Head a parcel of the most False and Impudent Assertions, in Matters of Fact, and the most unjust Calumnies, that ever the Press groaned under. And it is a wonder that a Person pretending to Conscience, or to Christianity, could give such Scope to his Passion, as to have no regard to Truth: and indeed here is little, or no Matter of Debate, nor place for Vindication, but by Denying what he Asserteth without any Attempt to give Evidence for what is Asserted. I Deny not but that there may be found some few among the People that own Presbytery, who through Ignorance, and a mistaken Zeal, run into some of these Excesses that he Taxeth: but I know none who are Guilty of all that he Imputeth to us, *sine discrimine*: and I am sure the more Sober and Intelligent sort of Presbyterians, abhorreth many of these things that he Chargeth them with. He Asserteth that *the Presbyterians of Scotland abhorre and cast off all Established Forms and Rules in the Worship of GOD.* I Challenge him to Prove what he saith: it is a palpable Fallhood. For, 1. We neither abhorre nor cast off the *Form of Sound Words*, I mean the Scriptures of Truth, recommended by the Apostle for us to hold, ὑγιαινόντων 1 *Tim.* 1. 13. nor do we abhorre or reject the Form of Baptizing, and Administring the LORD'S Supper; nor of Blessing the People at the Dismissing of the Assembly. 2. Even some Forms that we Reject, as needles, and therefore unfit to be used in this state of the Church, yet we do not abhor them; such as Forms of Prayer, we think they were both Lawful, and necessarie, when the Church was not Provided with Qualified Ministers: yet we think they should now be laid aside, when they are not so needed: as a Man should not use Crutches when he is well Recovered from his Lameness. 3. To say that we abhorre and reject Rules in the Worship of GOD is beyond all bounds of Truth, and Modesty. We own, and use the Word of GOD as the Rule of Worshiping Him: neither do we abhorre or reject the Help of Humane Rules which are drawn out of that Supreme and Divine Rule: we have our *Directorie*, and many Good *Acts of General-Assemblies*, yea, *of Synods*, and *Presbyteries*, in their respective Districts. His next Assertion is shameles above measure: that *since the Revolution, they Turn out the Episcopal Clergy out of their Livings, if they retain any of the Ancient forms, tho never so short, Catholick, or Orthodox.*

dox. Pray Sir, when was this done, by whom, where, or to whom? none of them were ever Turned out of their Livings on these Heads, either by Church or State; and none by the Church except for Ignorance, Error in some Great Point of Faith, supine negligence, or Scandal in Things that are not Controverted among us whether they be Sins, or not. It is true, Uniformity, even in these little Things, is required of these who will Joyn with us, be Received into Ministerial Communion, and have a Share of the Government of the Church with us (and much Tenderness, and Forbearance hath been used even in these, for some time) but they who think not fit to Joyn with us, are suffered to follow their Ministerial Work in their Parishes, and Enjoy their Livings, without such Uniformity with us, as he Talketh of. And if we had Required this, or Turned them out, it had been but an Imitating of the Practice of his own Party. Whom do they Suffer to Enjoy Publick Livings who do not Conform to their Way, to the Height?

§ 14. He persists in his false Assertions, while he saith, *the Episcopal Clergy are Enjoyned to forbear the LORD'S Prayer, Reading the Holy Scriptures in their Assemblies, the Apostolick Creed, and the Doxology.* This is far from any Semblance of Truth: no such Prohibition was ever given. He insisteth a little in Pleading for the Use of *the LORD'S Prayer*: but taketh no Notice of the State of the Question about it, as it hath been Proposed by his Antagonist. His Business seemeth to be, not so much to Convince, as to Accuse. It is False that *we have Banished that Prayer.* We duely use it as a Directory, and Pray according to it; we Teach it to our *Catechumeni*, we do not Judge, nor Blame any Man for using the Words: and if he can shew us a Command for using them, we shall Obey it. He saith, *it was Enjoyned by CHRIST to his Disciples.* If he mean, that the Words should be Recited, we desiderate the Proof: nor do we find that any of the Apostles, in their Publick Administrations so used it. It is true, the Presbyterians formerly used it; and if they should do so still, I should not Reclaim: but I know that his Parties making it their *Shibboleth*, together with Conviction of the Indifferency of so using it, gave the first Occasion for disusing it. It is an unaccountable Fancy, that *the Omission of these have no Tendency but to promote Atheism*: this is the general *Cant* of the Partie concerning what ever is out of their Road. As this his Assertion is most unreasonable, and groundless in it self; there being other means far more Effectual to keep out Atheism than the Use of these Forms can be supposed to be: so Common Observation and Experience

Experience sheweth, that the Atheism that we all should Lament, is no more visible, nor common, among that Party of Christians who do not use these Forms, than among them who are fond of them. I can draw no other Conclusion from what follows, *p.* 290, 291. but that the Author was, when he Wrote these Things, in the *Paroxism* that he professed to be in when he Wrote another Book, *viz.* provocked to *the Indecency of Passion*, to see his beloved Forms neglected. Hence he telleth us of *the Madness and Dreams of idle People, and the Humour of Schism: hindring the Holy Scriptures to be Read in the Assemblies as heretofore.* whereas it is evident (and the Reverend *Mr. Boise* hath made it appear, on occasion of the like Accusation against us by the *Bishop of Londonderry*) that the Scripture is more Read in our Congregations, and People is made more acquained with them, than heretofore in the Episcopal Meetings. I mean where the Orders of our Church are observed: for them who Read but a *verse* or *two* for a *Lecture*, I cannot Answer for their Practice: and we make the People understand the Reading, as *Ezra* did, *Neh.* 5. 5. which was not done in the Episcopal Church of *Scotland*: but Men who had no Authority, nor were Teachers in the Church, were set up to dispence this Ordinance of CHRIST, the Reading of the Scripture in the Congregation. He next blameth us (under the same Epithets of *Madness, Dreams, Humour of Schism*) that *when Children are Baptized, the Parents are not allowed to know into what Religion or Faith they are initiated*; and this, *because they are not made to repeat the Creed.* I first ask him, what Faith do the Generality of Parents of his Partie understand their Children to be Intiated into by their Repeating that which we call the *Apostles Creed*, which they cannot understand by our Conduct: seing some of them understand it not; and seing it doth not sufficiently Discriminate the sound Faith which we own, from *Socinianism, Poperie, Antinomianism*, and several other gross Errors. Next, I Answer, that it is false and Calumnious that he Asserteth: they are not only allowed to know the Faith that their Infants are Baptized into; but pains is taken so far as Ministers can, to make them understand that Faith: and they are Solemnly taken Engaged to adhere to that Faith, and to breed their Children in the knowledge of it, and it is told them what Faith we mean, by designing it from the Scripture, the great Rule of it, and the Confession of Faith of this Church, drawn out of the Scripture. If any have no other Notion of Baptism but that *it is an Engagement to be a Covenanter* (which he would have us believe, tho I am perswaded he knoweth better things)

we give no ground for such a Thought, but endeavour to present things otherwise to them.

§ 15. He saith *we are so unfixed and variable, that not* two *in the Nation in publick follow the same Rule*, &c. This is a horrid Abusing of the Reader, and can have no other Design but to make the Presbyterians odious where they are not known; for in *Scotland*, even among his own Party, the contrarie is well known. But all this Noise is, because we have no *stinted Liturgie*: without which we follow the same Rules, both Divine and Humane, as I shewed before, we all teach the same Truths; and Administer the same Ordinances; and in the same manner, except that we use not the same Words: wherein yet we do not studie a diversitie, as he injuriously Asserteth. His Apology for the Episcopal Church of *Scotland* for wanting a Liturgie is odd; *the Clergy Composed Prayers for themselves from which they seldom varied.* It may be some of them did so, either from insufficiency or lazieness: but I am sure neither the greatest, nor the best part of them did so: but what ever be in that, both on his side, and on ours, they who did not tie themselves to the same Words, at all times, managed their Work *with as much plainess, gravity, and coherence of their Words, and left the People as little in the Dark*, as they did whom he so much Commendeth on these Accounts. His calling Praying without a set Form, *Rambling*, and Ascribing to it *no Order, nor Dependence, but what is caused by the heat of the Animal Spirits*: I neglect, as shewing a Temper of mind that is to be pitied rather than Redargued by Argument. He waveth the Debate about *stinted Forms*, *p.* 292. which any who Readeth this Discourse must understand that he intendeth not to Dispute by Scripture, or Reason, against him whom he Opposeth in this, but to Rail at him: And because I intend not to engage with him at that Weapon, I shall wave it too. Yet he bringeth *Calvines* Testimony for the Preference of a *well Composed Liturgie*; out of one of his Epistles, which he so Citeth, as no Man shall find it, unless he happen to have the same Edition of *Calvines* Epistles that he used; which I have not: had he named the Epistle by its Number, or the Person to whom Addressed, I might have found it by some pains. I oppose *Calvine* to *Calvine*; he said of the *English Liturgie* (and I suppose that will pass with my Author for a *well Composed* one) that *it had in it some Tollerabiles ineptias.* He bringeth some what that looketh like Argument, even in this Debate that he waveth. *The great things of Worship is not to be left to the Wisdom and Discretion of every private Administrator.* A. This is provided against by

by the Churches trying Men well before they be Intrusted: by setting the Word, and the Acts of the Church before them, as their Rule and Directorie, and by Watching over them, and Correcting them for mismanagement. These are GOD'S ways of preventing Inconveniency; a *stinted Liturgie* is a way of Mans devising, without any Warrant, or Footstep of it in the Scripture. Another of his Arguments: *every Priest is not wise enough to manage an Affair of such great Importance.* A. That is so true that none is wise enough for it, as the Apostle saith, 2 Cor. 2. 6. And if so, who is fit to Compose a *Liturgie* for others; which all Men must be tyed to? On this Consideration, the Church ought to chuse the fitest Men she can get; and when that is done; both the weaker, and stronger Sort should beware of leaning to their own Wit and Parts in that Great Work; and should take the Word of GOD for their Directorie, and Depend on the Spirit of GOD for His assistence: and this is a better Remedy of the Evil feared than a *stinted Liturgy* is; and hath more Countenance in the Scripture, *Rom.* 8. 26. Another Argument. *Though a Minister should be very Wise, yet at all times he is not in the same Temper, and it is not reasonable that the Worship of GOD should be less decent when his Intellectuals are clouded than when he is in perfect health.* A. 1. If this Argument have any strength, we must have a Form of Preaching, as well as of Prayer; and always tyed to it: for a Disordered mind may make sad work there. 2. Some have been out of Temper for Reading the Service, as well as for Extemporary Prayer; when their Brain hath been clouded: and this hath as often hapened in the Reading Pue, as in the Presbyterian Pulpit. Wherefore, we must have another Remedy against it in both, than a Liturgie. 3. I confess a lesser Degree of decency in the Worship of GOD than should be, or hath been, is never *reasonable*: but how can it be prevented either in Praying, Preaching, or Reading, as long as, the Temper both of Mens Bodies, and of their Minds are variable. 4. If *a Mans Intellectuals* be at any time so *clouded*, whether by a Hypochondriack Distemper, or by Drinking too liberally, or by any other Sickness; as that it is probable to make the Worship of GOD to be unduely Managed, that Man (what ever have been his Wisdom or Abilities) should not be suffered to Officiate at that time; whether with, or without the Book: I am sure there was never any Church, Ancient or Modern, which appointed a Liturgie for such Men; nor to countenance the Putting, or Keeping, such in the Sacred Function. 5. There is another Cause of Worship being better or worse

Managed at diverſe times, which our Author hath not thought on, nor will his Liturgie ſerve for a Remedie of it; that is the better or worſe Frame of his Soul, with reſpect to Heavenly things, and the Degrees of the Preſence and Aids of the Spirit of GOD: therefore, however unreaſonable it be, yet it is manifeſt, that there is not the ſame meaſure of Decency, and Spiritual Luſter on the Worſhip of GOD at all times: nor can there be a Remedie for this, till we be better Men: nor even then, if the LORD for His own Holy ends, withdraw his preſence: I know this will be flouted by ſome: but the Apoſtle himſelf had his unuſual Inlargements, 2 *Cor.* 5. 11. and found it needful that the People ſhould Pray for aſſiſtence to him, *Col.* 4. 3.

§. 16. He bringeth yet another Reaſon: *the ſpiritual neceſſities of the People ought at all times to be equally Provided for.* A. 1. That is impoſſible for Man to do: unleſs we can find unchangeable Men to be Miniſters. It is fair if they be always well, and ſometimes, if they be tollerablly provided for. 2. This is the improperеſt Reaſon that he could have fallen upon; for it cutteth the Throat of his Cauſe: becauſe the Spiritul Neceſſities of the People are very various: diverſe People have diverſe Neceſſities: and the ſame Perſons Needs may be far other, or greater, at one time than at another: they know little of the Spiritual ſtate of Souls, who know not this; now a *ſtinted Liturgie* can never reach theſe, half ſo well as a Miniſter may do, who hath the Giſt of Prayer; and who endeavoureth, as much as may be, to be acquainted with the Caſes of the Peoples Souls. Next, he Pleadeth *Uniformity* for the uſe of a *ſtinted Liturgie*, which is a weak Argument: for Uniformity in Words (and that is all that we can have by a *Liturgie*, which cannot be obtained without it) is not ſo valuable. If we all ſpeak the ſame things what great Matters is it if they be expreſt in diverſe Words. Again, what Reaſon is there for the Neceſſity of *Uniformity* in Prayer, more than in Preaching? which yet our Brethren do not Enjoin. That the Forms he mentioneth are the *Teſſera's if Uniformity*, is an abſurd and groundleſs Aſſertion: there was Uniformity in the Apoſtolick Church, and is in our Churches, without them. If he deny this laſt, let him ſhew what Diſformity is among us, further than in Words, which he cannot ſhew to be among his own Partie; yea, it is evident that ſuch Diſcrepancie is in their Worſhip, in one Church from another, that he cannot Charge us with the like: for the Cathedral Service, and that in Countrey Churches, are more unlike to one another, than the Latter of them

them is to the Meetings of ſome Diſſenters. He next Argueth, that a *Liturgie obviates Mens venting their own Conceits.* A. This is far more readily and frequently done in Preaching than in Prayer: and therefore will either Prove that free Preaching, without a Book, ſhould be Reſtrained; or it Proveth nothing at all. And indeed the way to prevent Inconveniency in both, is not a *Liturgie*, but to be careful that none but well Qualified Men be in the Miniſtry, and Watchfully to look to the Adminiſtrations of them who are in that Office.

§ 17. Our Author, *p.* 295. *& ſeq.* Haleth in a Diſcourſe by Head and Ears, without Occaſion given, or Coherence with what he was upon, concerning *Superſtition*; wherein he taketh it for granted that his Way, in all the Parts and Steps of it, is right, and ours wholly wrong: and on this Begged Hypotheſis, he Declaimeth againſt the Presbyterians as *the moſt Superſtitious*, yea, *the moſt Atheiſtical* Men in the World. This is an eaſy Way of Running down any Adverſary whatſoever. Whether *a Groundleſs Scrupuloſity*, either in Matters of common Practice, or in Matters of Worſhip, be *Superſtition* or not, I know is controverted by ſome: I ſhall not now enter into this Debate; knowing that it iſſueth into a mere *Logomachy*. Tho I think *Superſtition*, being a ſort of falſe Worſhip, or a Sin againſt the Worſhip of God, in Strickneſs of Speech, nothing ſhould be called *Superſtition*, but that whereby People intend, or pretend to Worſhip God. Scruples about what is not Worſhip may be very Sinful, becauſe Unreaſonable and Groundleſs, and yet not be Worſhip, nor *Superſtition*. If he can prove that our Scrupling the Holy Days, Liturgy and Ceremonies, is without all Ground, and that theſe things are well Warranted, and Approved of God; and that there is no Sin in Uſing them: we ſhall change our Opinion, and ſubmit to what Cenſure he ſhall put on us. But while that is not done, (as I am ſure it hath not hitherto been performed) we regard little his Railing Accuſations that he filleth his Pages with. Moſt of what he here Loadeth the Presbyterians with, may be evidently, and with good Reaſon, Retorted on himſelf, and his Party. For Inſtance, he ſaith *when we repreſent the Deity, as one that is pleaſed with the Imaginary Notions that we Groundleſly entertain of Things; this is Superſtition, that Poyſons the Soul and all its Faculties.* Now whether Presbyterians or Prelatiſts be more guilty of this, let the Reader Judge. The one think that God is pleaſed with nothing as Worſhip, but what He hath Preſcribed in His Word: And that He hateth Will-Worſhip, and all Notions about that, which have

have no Foundation in Scripture. The other think God is pleaſed with a great many Things that Men have have Deviſed for Adorning His Worſhip; and for an Order and Decency that they imagine to be ſuch; but the Lord hath never declared it to be ſuch. Whether of the two entertain theſe Groundleſs Notions of the Deity, which are the *Superſtition* that *Poyſoneth the Soul and all its Faculties*? Another Inſtance: *to ſay that ſuch a thing is forbidden of God, only becauſe we forbid it our ſelves, is to teach for Doctrines the Commandments of Men: but to regulate our Actions in themſelves indifferent, according to the Prudent Determination of our Superiours, cannot fall under that Cenſure.* Let us ſee whether we, or his own Party be thus guilty. We diſowne that we ſay of any one thing, that it is forbidden of God, becauſe we forbid it: if we ſay of any thing, that God hath forbidden it, and do not prove that it is ſo; we refuſe not to bear the Blame of ſuch Impiety: but it is manifeſt, that his Party uſe ſomethings, as if God had enjoyned them, when they cannot prove that it is ſo; but only the Church hath enjoyned them: they Command People to obey, to Uſe their Ceremonies, they Urge them with Rigour, they do more ſeverely Cenſure the Neglect of them, than they Puniſh Breaking of Gods plain Commands. And yet they cannot ſhew, nor do they pretend to, any other Warrant for them, but the Authority of the Church; which he calleth *the Prudent Determination of our Superiors*. It were needleſs, as well as endleſs, to take notice of all the Fantaſtick Notions that he expreſſeth about *Superſtition*, and his Ungrounded Suppoſitions, that the Presbyterians are of theſe Sentiments, in which he placeth it: what is ſaid may give a ſufficient Taſte of his Way of Refuting his Adverſaries: only I cannot paſs, that *p.* 29*c*. he inſinuateth, that the Presbyterians *eſteem the Means more than the End; and ſeparate the Eccleſiaſtical Laws from their Subordination and Relation to the Laws of God.* It muſt be a ſtrange Degree of Prejudice, that could ſeduce him into ſuch Diſtorted Notions. Do we *eſteem the Means more than the End*, becauſe we would have the *End*, Edification, carried on by *Means* that God hath Appointed, and that He hath Promiſed a Bleſſing to, rather than by Means of Mans Deviſing, which have no Promiſe of a Bleſſing or Succeſs? It is not only Conſcience of Pleaſing God, but Concern for that *End*, that maketh us ſo Careful, that the *Means* we uſe be Approved of God. Or do we *ſeparate Eccleſiaſtical Laws, from their Relation and Subſerviency to the Laws of God*: we are ſo far from it, that we owne no Eccleſiaſtical Laws, which are without the Relation of Dependency on

on the Law of God; or without due Subordination to it: and it is on this Head that we reject the Church Laws, that enjoyn Humane Ceremonies peculiar to the Worſhip of God; becauſe the Church hath no Warrant to make ſuch Laws, (if he ſay that ſhe hath, let us ſee it) and becauſe theſe Laws are not Subordinate, but rather Co-ordinate to the Laws of God, ſetting up the Churches Inſtitutions beſide his. That the *Negative Scrupuloſity* that he mentioneth from *Coloſſ.* 2. 21, 22, 23. is a great Evil, we doubt not: and if he will call it *Superſtition*, we will not contend about Words (tho the Reaſon of that Denomination is doubtful; the *Will-Worſhip* that is mentioned, being rather to be referred to the *Worſhipping of Angels*, ſpoken of *v.* 18. which is there, and alſo in Conjunction with this *Will-Worſhip*, called *Humility*; that is a vain Shew, of it.) But nothing of this maketh for his Purpoſe, unleſs he can prove, that our Scruples about the Ceremonies, are wholly Groundleſs, as theſe Scruples were; and as the reſt of the Abſtinences are, that he mentioneth; wherefore all that he, at great length, Diſcourſeth on this Head, is wholly impertinent. If he can prove the Ceremonies to be *Excellent and Uſeful*, as he inſinuateth, *p.* 297. our Cauſe cannot ſtand before him.

§ 18. He undertaketh to prove our Scruples to be more dangerous than theſe, in that *the Scruples there mentioned, had a Shew of Wiſdom; but the Presbyterian Scruples have more dangerous Conſequences, in that they condemn thoſe Solemnities of Religion, which have a direct Tendency to promote Religion, in all its moſt Excellent Branches.* The import of this Ratiocination is, the Way of the Ceremonialiſts is right, *Ergo*, the Presbyterians are to be condemned. All this is purely Begging of the Queſtion. We deny any ſuch Tendency to be in the Ceremonies; and cannot be perſwaded of what he ſaith, by his Confident Aſſeverations, and Big Words. If I could find any thing in his following Pages, that is worth Anſwering, and hath not been already Anſwered, (for he repeateth *ad nauſeam*) I ſhould conſider it. The Perſons that he knew, *who were ſo Fearful and Superſtitious, that they would not Break up a Letter on Sunday*, we do not approve; nor do our Scruples Countenance ſuch Miſapprehenſions: if we meet with any ſuch, (for I know none of them, but rather obſerve that an undue Liberty is taken generally, on the Lords Day) we ſhall endeavour to inſtruct them better. He telleth us, *p.* 302. the fifth or ſixth time, that *Superſtition leadeth to Atheiſm*; and addeth, *that by the Power of Prejudice, and Faction, it maketh a Man Deſpiſe the Omniſci-*

ence

ence of God, and to Venture upon the most Daring Impieties. Tho I will not be an Advocat for *Superstition*, nor for Ignorant or Groundless *Scrupulosity*: yet this his Assertion I cannot understand: for it is the Apprehension of Gods Omniscience, that maketh these Poor Souls, who *dare not Break up a Letter on the Lords Day*, to Fear where no Fear is; and it is want of all Scrupling, even where there is just Ground, that maketh People Venture on the most Daring Impieties; it is because they are *Stout Hearted*, not because they are *Fearful Hearted.* And how *Faction* cometh in to make up the Scene, I cannot see; but that Presbyterians, whom he hath concluded to be *Factious*, must be the Persons to be thus Loaded. His Probative Instance of what he had said, is yet less Accountable. It is, that *the Covenanters, when they in their full Career against the ancient Constitutions of Church and State*, (thus his Prejudice against them, doth represent them to him, and his Hatred of them, maketh him so represent them to the World) *with Hands lifted up to Heaven abjured the Primitive Stations*: and these *Stations* he highly extolleth; and thinketh the Presbyterians know not what they are, and concludeth, that *we are bound by the Covenant, never to be present at such Exercises of Mortifications, &c.* The *Stations* were their Meetings on *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*, for Fasting till Nine of the Clock, and for other Spiritual Exercises. So *Albaspin.* whom he citeth, and his *Adnotator Keitombellius. Observ.* 16. *p.* 23, 24. who also telleth us that this they did, *primis illis sæculis, quibus miseriis & persecutionibus undique, & quasi perpetuis stiparentur.* I know no Presbyterian, who either hath Sworn against, or Condemneth these *Stations*; so far as we have a distinct Account of them: have not we, in great Towns the same thing, on the Matter, with these *Stations*: Morning Exercises for Confession of Sin, Prayer, and Instructing of the People; and that oftner, in some Places, than Twice a Week. That the Primitive *Stations* are abjured in the Covenant, is falsly asserted: indeed in the *National Covenant*, or *Confession of Faith*, which was Subscribed by the King, the Nobility, and the whole Nation, they Renounce a great many of the Popes Doctrines, and Practices; and *his Stations* are mentioned among them: but will any Man, who understandeth what he saith, or who doth not look on the whole of Popery as Pure and Primitive, say, that the Popish *Stations*, (under the present Degeneracy of that Church) and the Primitive *Stations*, were the same thing? the best Account that I can find of what now is called *Stations* among the Papists, is from *Onuphrius Panvinius, de stationibus urbis Romæ*;

mæ: where he confeſſeth that their Original is obſcure: he maketh them, in the Primitive Church, to have been *Prayers with Standing, in Oppoſition to theſe with Kneeling*: to which ſometimes Faſting was joyned, and he ſheweth how ſeveral Popes Limited them, and others appropriated them to certain Days: and ſheweth how in his time they were fixed to Days; and to Churches in the City of *Rome*: as it may be preſumed was done alſo in other Churches. He ſheweth alſo their Number, *viz.* in fourty ſeven Churches, ninety ſix *Stations*, on eighty three Days, and telleth us of *Indulgences* granted to theſe *Stations* by *Pope Boniface*. This Term may alſo be applyed to their Solemn Proceſſions, for Perambulating any Piece of Ground: wherein they do often Stand at ſuch a Croſs, or at ſuch a Turning, and Rehearſe certain Prayers. This Supeſtition is what is renounced in the Covenant, and it is joyned with *Peregrinations* and ſuch other Fopperies. He calleth *Superſtition a Baſtard Kind of Worſhip*, *p.* 305. but Scrupling at Ceremonies, hath nothing in it like Worſhip, whether Baſtard or Legitimate: how will he then Reconcile this, with Calling our Scruples *Superſtition*? The *Jewiſh Superſtitions*, *the Murdering of A. Biſhop Sharp*, *the Heathens Superſtitions*, that he hath Conſulted *Juvenal* about, none of theſe touch the Presbyterians; tho one of them was Acted by ſome who bare that Name, to the great Diſlike of the reſt of them. He further Argueth, *p.* 307, 308. that *we Contend for our own Opinions*, *he for the Church and her Catholick Conſtitutions*. The ſame Arguments the Papiſts uſe againſt Proteſtants: the Name of the *Church* is the Shelter that ſome flee to, when they have no other Cover for the Nakedneſs of their Opinions. We affirm (and our Aſſertion is as Probative as his is) that we maintain the Opinions that we have Learned from the Scripture, and not ſuch as we have Groundleſly *Choſen* for our ſelves.

§ 19. He next, *p.* 309. falleth on the *Catechiſm* which is owned and taught in this Church; after he hath Loaded us with *Servile Condeſcending to Popular Fancies*, *and Leaving the People in Profound Ignorance*. This is his Strain, his *Genius*, and to be Neglected; his Reproaches, and Praiſes are of the ſame Value with us. The Quarrel that he hath with the *Catechiſm*, is, *it is Unintelligible by the People*, (which were a great Fault if true) and that *it is Adapted to ſerve the Hypotheſis of a certain Order of School Men*: he meaneth, as is evident by what followeth, the *Dominicans*, or *Janſeniſts*, in Oppoſition to the *Jeſuits*: his Grievance is, our *Catechiſm* is not *Pelagian*, nor *Arminian* enough. I ſhall free

him of a Fear that he expresseth, *p.* 315. that *if the Vindicator* (as he calleth him) *take these Paragraphs to Task, he will most Zealously Undertake the Defence of all that Orthodox Stuff, that is Contained in their Publick Catechisms, and Write out a whole System to Confute his Adversary.* Whatever be that Persons Zeal to Defend our *Catechisms*, as intirely Orthodox; he need not Fear Writing of a System on this Occasion; the Person he Aimeth at, will be more Sparing than so, of his Ink and Paper; and yet more of his Time and Labour: unless he saw more Hazard to Truth, than can arise from this Authors Attempt: and unless there were none who could do it to better Purpose, as there are many: seing he intendeth not *to Question the Orthodoxy of the Catechism*, (tho he often Lasheth it that Way by severe *Innuendo's*) but only to Prove *its Unintelligibleness*: I shall engage with him only in that. He Talketh Big, of many Instances which might be brought, wherein our *Catechisms* are *Unintelligible*; but he is pleased to pitch but on one; which is that Question; *Wherein consisteth the Sinfulness of that Estate whereinto Man fell*: to which the Answer is, *The Sinfulness of that Estate whereinto Man fell, consisteth in the Guilt of Adams first Sin, the Want of Original Righteousness, and Corruption of his whole Nature, which is commonly called Original Sin, together with all Actual Transgressions which proceed from it.* I shall Animadvert a few Things on this his Essay, before I consider particularly the Proofs of *Obscurity* and *Unintelligibleness* of this Doctrine. 1. If I should yield all that he here proposeth to himself, he falleth short of his Design; which is to Reproach the *Scots* Presbyterians: for tho they owne that *Catechism*, and look on it as one of the best extant, yet it is not of their Composure; it was done by the Divines Assembled at *Westminster*, few of whom were Presbyterians. 2. Few Men of Sense, who are Concerned about the Promoting of Religion, and the Salvation of Souls, will prefer it to the Church of *Englands Catechism*, which beginneth, *What is thy Name*; *Who gave thee this Name, &c.* but will owne that there is more sound, plain, useful Truth, and what is necessary to be known by the People, in our, than in their *Catechism*. As might easily be made appear, if I might Digress to State a Comparison between them, from the Beginning to the End. 3. We must not imagine, that whatever is put into a *Catechism*, must be so plain, that the meanest Capacity, without Help, can sufficiently understand it: for there are Truths needful to be known, which the People must be helped to understand, tho at first View, they Comprehend them not:

not: yea, ſomethings muſt be taught to all the People, and are neceſſary to be known by Chriſtians, which tho they are intelligible, yet are not ſo eaſily underſtood, nor ſo fully, as ſome other Things, can be. If this Author will take on him, to judge of the Labour of ſuch a Grave and Learned Aſſembly, as was that at *Weſtminſter*, and conclude, that they Acted Fooliſhly, in Propoſing Unintelligible Doctrines to the People, let him give alſo his Cenſure of the *Apoſtolick Catechiſm*; the Subſtance of which is ſet down *Heb.* 6. 1, 2. where are Matters, that as many Difficulties may be raiſed about, as he Starteth on this Queſtion and Anſwer. 4. I hope he doth not Dream, that no Truths are to be Propoſed to the *Catechumeni*, but ſuch as the meaneſt (yea, or the greateſt Capacity) can fully Comprehend, and Solve all the Difficulties, yea, or Underſtand all the Debates, that ariſe in the Heads of Learned Men about them: for then, they muſt be kept in Profound Ignorance of all the Myſteries of our Religion, yea, of the Greateſt, moſt Fundamental, and moſt Neceſſary Truths that the Scripture Teacheth us. If he were put to Frame a *Catechiſm* ſo Qualified, he would find it hard to get Matter for it. He ſhould conſider, that the Uſe of a *Catechiſm*, is not to make the People Polemick Divines at firſt Hand, but to Acquaint them with the Poſitive Doctrine of Salvation, and to Lay before them Scripture Grounds for Aſſenting to it. 5. The Doctrine of this Queſtion and Anſwer, is very neceſſary to be known, as on other Grounds, ſo in Order to the Exerciſe of Goſpel Repentance: which is hard to ſay any can have, who is wholly Ignorant of *Original Sin*, which is here, as plainly and fully Deſcribed, as hath been done by any, in ſo few Words. One may be Jealous, that Picking this Quarrel with the *Catechiſm*, ariſeth rather from Diſlike of the Truths here Taught, than from the Obſcurity of it. If he allow Original Sin to be Taught to the People at all, let him try if he can Frame a plainer Queſtion and Anſwer about it. 6. It is the Care of Presbyterian Miniſters, that People may underſtand the Grounds of our Religion, as well as may be, not only to lay down, even in the *Catechiſm*, the Scriptures where ſuch Doctrines are Taught, that the Peoples Faith may ſtand on that ſure Foundation, but alſo they Explain the *Catechiſm*, and all the Doctrines contained in it, to them, when they *Catechiſe*, and ſometimes in Preaching; and do not content themſelves, that the People can Repeat the Words of the *Catechiſm*: and therefore it is no ſufficient Objection againſt the *Catechiſm*, that any Paſſage in it is not ſo Obvious to

every Capacity, as might be wisht. Notwithstanding of all that I have said, I do not yield that this, or any other Passage in the *Catechism*, is Unintelligible by an ordinary Capacity, where Attention, and Diligence is used, toward Attaining of Knowledge. 7. Tho it were to be wished, that *all the Lords People were Prophets*, and that every one of them were able to Debate for the Truth, and to stop the Mouths of Gainsayers: yet we think it should be endeavoured, that People generally should know the σῶι of these Revealed Truths, which are Conducible to their Salvation, and to Direct them in the Way of Duty; and if some cannot Attain such a Measure of Knowledge in them as is Desireable; others who are more Docile, should not be Deprived of what Advantage they can attain.

§ 20. Our Author having set down the Question and Answer, saith, *there is nothing in it but is Dark, and altogether beyond the Comprehension of Illiterate People: yea, that it cannot be understood without Acquaintance with the Language of the School Men*: he calleth it *Clouds of Unknown Language*: all this is as easily denyed as it is asserted, and with far more Reason: for we can give the Instances of many, (tho may be, they will not be willing to be Named, as he requireth) who can give a good Account, without School Terms, of the Doctrine here Compriſed; who yet know no other Language, but their Mother Tongue. He telleth us that *the first Difficulty is, de reatu peccati primi hominis*: I confess, if he propose it thus in Latine, it will puzzle most of the Vulgar, (whom he Despiseth under the Name of *Plow Men*) but there are *Plow Men*, and others, who in their own Language, can tell you that thus it is with us, that we are guilty of *Adams* Sin; and can bring Scripture Proof for what they say, out of *Rom.* 5. 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18. Our Countrey People can understand, that in that Passage of Scripture, it is plain, that we are guilty of *Adams* Sin, and that we are justified by Christs Righteousness: and so they will tell you, that Scripture holdeth forth the *Imputation* of both; and they understand what is meant by that hard Word. His next Difficulty is, *de privatione justitiæ originalis*; and he Complaineth, that *the English Word doth not determine, whether it be Privation or Negation*: our People can tell, (and some are Sensible of it, and Weighted with it) that they have no Righteousness of their own, nor Rectitude in their Nature, that they are neither Born with it, nor can Acquire it, but must have it from Christ, or perish without it: for the Terms he mentioneth, they do not trouble themselves about these, nor

do

do we think it neceſſary that they ſhould. His third Remark ſeemeth to make the Anſwer to the Queſtion, not only Obſcure, but Erroneous: for he maketh it to inſinuate, that the *Rectitude of Mens Souls is wholly loſt, and that there are no remains of the Divine Image left on the Soul of Man.* It is no wonder that he thinketh the Vulgar cannot underſtand this Anſwer, when ſo Learned a *Dr.* doth ſo foully Miſapprehend it; I ſhall not impute this to want of Capacity, nor to the Objective Darkneſs of the Thing; but to his Prejudice, or want of Attention: for it is plain to any who will underſtand, that this is neither ſaid nor hinted and that it is manifeſt that the Corruption of all the Faculties, not the total Corruption of all, or any of them, is there Expreſſed. Such a Blunder as this, in another, he would have Inſulted over. A further Evidence of the Obſcurity that he would Prove, *that our ſinful Eſtate conſiſteth alſo in all the actual Tranſgreſſions that proceed from this Original ſin.* He muſt have a very dark mind to whom this is unintelligible. But the Great Matter is, that *he that Anſwereth muſt Re-collect all theſe things,* (and they are but 4. in Number) *before he underſtand this Matter.* What mighty Difficulty is in that? or wherein lyeth the *Neceſſity of Metaphyſicks for underſtanding theſe Particulars,* or making Re-collection of them, I cannot Comprehend: nor can I underſtand how *Peoples being Incumbred with the Affairs of Humane Life, putteth them out of Caſe for attaining the Knowledge that we Debate about.* What he further hath under this Head, is made up of Harſh Words and bitter Cenſures, not to be Anſwered: that *the Catechiſm was only deſigned as the Badge of a Partie* (as if the Prelatiſts met at *Weſtminſter* deſigned a *Shibboleth* for the *Scots* Presbyterians to be diſtinguiſhed by) this is wiſe talk: he calleth it *ſuch Words as Monks and ill natured Zealots pitched upon: it is nothing elſe but to lift up a Banner for Faction, Ignorance, and Superſtition. They* (the People) *are Taught by their Leaders to baule againſt the Ancient Methods of the Chriſtian Church, and that which they ſet up in Oppoſition to it, leads them naturally to Pride, and Enthuſiaſm*: Let any Man whoſe Tongue is under any Reſtraint from the aw of GOD, or regard to Man, tell us how this can be applied to the *Catechiſm.* More ſtuffe of this Stamp, he hath, which I am wearie to Tranſcribe. He ſaith, *this Charge may be fairly managed againſt the Catechiſm in general, as well as againſt this Queſtion.* And I am Confident all ſuch Attempts may receive a full and plain Anſwer. He is pleaſed alſo to Reproach *the Homilies of the Presbyterians* (ſo in Contempt he calleth their Preaching of the Goſpel) with *the ſame ſtrain*; he muſt mean *unintelligibleneſs*: from

from which he falleth into a new Fit of calling his Oppoſites by what ill Names he pleaſeth. Such an Indefinite Charge as this is not to be Anſwered; but by Denying it: and I am ſure he can never Prove it, the Stories collected, or deviſed by his Friend, the Author of *the Presbyterian Eloquence*, are not Probative, where Senſe or Reaſon, or Candor have place, no, not among his own Party, who know the Presbyterians.

§. 21. His next Charge againſt us is, a Repetition of what he brought, and I Anſwered before: that *the Scripture is not Read in Publick*; and this he ſaith, *is purſuant to the Deſign of keeping the People in the Dark.* He ſaith, *the Canonical Scriptures, as well as the Apocryphal* (a double Grievance in his eyes) *are laid aſide from publick uſe*, which he calleth *a bold ſtroke of Atheiſm, and Enthuſiaſm*: But wiſe Men will think that there is far more of *Atheiſm* in ſuch a Bold, Publick, Unlimited Affirming of what is an Evidence of having no regard to Truth. If there were any thing Argumentative (as the whole is moſt Abuſive, and deſtitute of Truth) in his Harangue that he ſeteth off theſe Falſehoods with, I ſhould be at the pains to give them a fair Anſwer: ſee what is ſaid of this § 14. He next, *p.* 317. Quarrelleth with our *Ruling Elders*: which he Introduceth with a Falſehood that is palpably ſuch, *viz.* that *we have put away Deacons, as well as Biſhops*: the World knoweth the contrarie: and if this Author do not know it, he is very unfit to talk of the Presbyterians, who is ſuch a Stranger to their Way, and Conſtitution. We have *Deacons*, whoſe Work it is to take Care of the Poor, according to Apoſtolick appointment. It is true, our *Deacons* are not allowed to Preach and Baptize, as theſe who in the Epiſcopal Church go under that Name: for we find no Warrant for giving them that Power, except it be immediately, and extraordinarily given them by the LORD; as it was to ſome (not to all) of the Primitive *Deacons*. It is alſo true, that in ſome places, the Office and Work of *Ruling Elder*, and of *Deacon*, is in the ſame Perſon: which hath Warrant from the Word: but that *we have no Deacons*, is ſaid without any Semblance of Truth. Tho he knoweth that, that Controverſie about *Ruling Elders*, who have no Preaching Power, hath been much agitated between his Partie and us, and his Antagoniſt (whoſe Writing he never failleth to Oppoſe, when he thinketh he can) hath Written on that Subject; yet he is pleaſed here to content himſelf with ſetting his *Nigrum theta* on this our Oppinion, without endeavouring to Refute it: except he will call it an Argument

ment, that he saith, *it is a Sacrilegious Usurpation on the Ecclesiastical Authority.* He hath *Two* Quarrels with them: One is, that *they are not set apart by Imposition of hands.* I have no other Answer to this, but that some among our selves are unsatisfied with this: but they are Solemnly and Pubickly set apart for their Work, and taken Engaged to it: and therefore, that want doth not Nullifie the Office. That such an Office should be in the Church by CHRIST'S Institution, I hold, tho I will not undertake to justifie the Practice of our own, or other Churches, in some things concerning these *Elders.* His other Fault that he findeth with them is, that *the Preachers encroach so on them, that they never suffer them, whose sole Office is Government, to interpose in the most Essential Points of Jurisdiction,* viz. *the Solemn and Authoritative Imposition of hands, Administration of Sacraments, and Absolution of Penetents.* This Objection amounteth to no more but this: Ruling Elders, by Divine appointment, have a Share in the Government of the Church for curbing of sin (for they are *Inspectores morum populi*) *Ergo,* they have also all the Authority that CHRIST hath given to the Pastors of the Flock, such Reasoning is not only in it self weak and fallacious, but it doth ill sute the Principles of this Author: do not his Party, at their own hand, give some part of Church Authority to their *Deacons,* as Preaching and Baptizing; and withhold from them all the rest of it: why then may not we (with much more reason) allow, that CHRIST hath given part of Church Power to these Elders, and yet not the whole of it? But I consider his Objection more particularly: the *first* Power (mentioned by him) as denyed them is, *Imposition of Hands* on the Pastors of the Church. If he can Prove that any other than Pastors have that Power, by Divine Warrant, he shall gain this Point. Neither is it consistent with Reason that *Imposition of Hands,* by which the Authority for dispensing the Word and Sacraments is conveyed, should be done by them who have not that Power themselves: for *nemo dat quod non habet.* The next is *Administration of Sacraments,* This is not due to them because they are not the Pastors of the Church; and because they are only Rulers of the Church: whereas this Administration is no part of Government. The 3*d.* is *Absolving of Penitents*: to which he might have Added *excommunication,* and other *Church Censures. A.* This belongeth to the Government of the Church; they have a Hand in it; nor is it done without them, for both Censures, and taking off Censures, are Decreed in the Consistorie, where they sit, and vote: only the Pronouncing, or Executing

Executing of these Sentences, in the publick Congregation, is the Work of the Pastor; both because publick Administration of CHRIST'S Ordinances are in his hand: and because these Administrations are intermixed, or conjoyned with the Word, and publick Prayer; which are the Work of the Minister, not of the Elder.

§ 22. Another *New Opinion* he Taxeth (but will not be at pains to Examine or Refute it) is, that *we think the People have a Right to Chuse their Pastors.* The *Novelty* of this Opinion is most absurdly Asserted: for it not only was the way of the Apostolick: but of the Primitive Church for many Ages, as I have shewed *Rational, Def. of non conformity,* § 6. *p.* 197. *&c.* and should now further have Debated it with him, if he had insisted on it. He misrepresenteth our Opinion, while *first* he saith, we *maintain this Right to be unalterable*: whereas we think a People may lose it, as to its present Exercise, by their inhability or negligence, and it devolveth into the hands of the Rulers of the Church. While *2dly,* He insinuateth, *p.* 320. that *this Power is allowed in the Body of the People, without due Restrictions and Limitations.* We think the People in this, as in all their other Religious concernments, are under the Inspection and Government of the Presbytery, Congregational, or Classical. Instead of Arguing against this Way, he laboureth to cast Dirt on it; which easily may be wiped off. I have proved, in the Place Cited, that they who were designed for the Ministry were not only named in the Congregation for their Assent, or Objecting against them; but they were chosen *a Clero et Plebe*: for the 36. *Canon* of the *Apostles* (it is, *Mihi,* 37.) which he Citeth: not only we Reject it, with the rest, as not Authentick, nor Probative: but it also Censureth the Bishop that doth not undertake the Office, and Charge: Doth it thence follow that a Bishop may be Imposed on a People without his own Consent, as well as without theirs? that *Canon* seemeth to be meant of some incident Dislike, either on the part of the Pastor, or of the People, after Ordination; which should not excuse them from mutual Duties: and so it is nothing to our purpose. How *popular Election* would hinder Uniformity, more than the Patrons Election doth; is hard to be understood. That *People will chuse such as themselves for Intellectuals and Morals,* doth not always hold: People generally think that their Pastors ought to have both more Learning, and more Religion, than themselves. And if they be of such perverse Inclinations, they are to be Over-ruled by the Presbytery. What he saith of *the scandalous effects*

of

of Popular Election (I ſuppoſe he meaneth Tumults and Diviſions) were far more viſible, frequent. and horrid, when Biſhops were otherwiſe choſen: there was never ſo much Blood-ſhed at Election of a Presbyterian Miniſter, as hath been at Chuſing of ſome Biſhops, in the Later Primitive times, after that Office was ſettled in the Church. What are we concerned more than his own Party is, in the Ridiculous Inſinuation he hath of *a Company of mean Mechanicks laying Wagers that ſuch a one ſhall Preach better than another.* Is any Church accountable for either the Follies, yea, or the Sinful Exceſſes of every one of her Members, further than to Rebuke, or Cenſure them, according to the degree of Offence given; when they come to be known? I know of no ſuch Wagers laid among our People, tho may be, there is too much of being Puffed up for one, againſt another; as it was in a Church that I hope he will have more reſpect for than for he hath for the Presbyterian Church, 1 *Cor.* 4. 6. That he Aſſerteth that *the Talent of Preaching did not commend a Man in the Primitive times*, is moſt abſurd, if he mean, that a great regard was not had to it, as one of the Chief Qualifications of a Paſtor of the Church; if he mean, that this Qualification only is regarded among the Presbyterians, and no more lookt after, it is falſe and injurious.

§. 23. His next Work is quite out of his preſent Road: it is not to conſider any *new Opinions* held by the Presbyterians: but to revive a Reproach he had before caſt on one Ptesbyterian, and which had been ſufficiently wiped off: but he is reſolved not to be ſatisfied. I am wholly indifferent whether he be, or not. And yet this Charge he only mentioneth; and therefore I ſhall not inſiſt on it neither: but it ſeems, this was but Introductory to what he intended: which is, he will Vindicat a Notion that *Grotius* hath about ἀντιλήψεις, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. who had Interpreted that Word as meant of Biſhops. I have abundantly Cleared this Matter, and Vindicated that Text from the Expoſition put on it by *Grotius*, in 3*d. Sect.* of this Work, § 6. 7. to which I refer the Reader, and ſhall now only Anſwer what our Author here bringeth afreſh. He telleth us ἀντιλαμβανω *ſignifieth properly to help one that is ready to fall: this is the Duty of them who are Stronger in the Faith, and higher in Authority: of whom then could it be ſo well meant as of the Biſhop, the Præſes.* A moſt ridiculous way of Arguing: For, 1. It ſuppoſeth the Queſtion, that Biſhop, or the *Præſides Presbyterii*, are higher in Authority: which we cannot yield. 2. It can be far better applyed to

Deacons, who relieve them who are ready to Perish. Next saith he: *Grotius* saw the Episcopal Authority in several Places that the *Vindicator* will not allow of. *A.* What *Grotius* saw, I know not, nor am concerned to know: Some fancy they see a Man in the Moon, which others cannot discern 3. *The Apostles might make use of Words to signifie the Episcopal Jurisdiction which are not in use in our Days; there are so many Allusions to the Temple and Synagogue, that we must know these, that we may be acquainted with the Writings of the New Testament.* *A.* This Reasoning may infer *quidlibet ex quolibet*: may be (might one say) the Apostles by Baptism, by casting out of the Church, *&c.* understood some other thing than we do: at this Rate *Scepticism* about the whole Doctrine of the New Testament may be brought in more effectually than by *laying aside Religious Ceremonies of Mens devising.* We know the Apostles Wrote in *Greek*; and we know what Ἀντιλήψεις signifieth in that Language: if this Author allege that it had then another Signification than now, he should have Proved it, and not drawn his Conclusion from *a May be.* And if he thinketh that there is any Allusion here to the Practice of the Temple or Synagogue, he should have shewed it, and not thought us so tame Animals as to acquiesce in his Gues, built on a Possibility, where he cannot shew so much as Probability. His Advice hath been followed, before it was given, in *Reading Grotius on the Places he mentioneth*; and yet nothing is found that maketh for his Design. He hath another Argument from the Context (which yet is the same above-mentioned, and Answered) that *the Apostle having in the preceeding*, v. (he should have said in the same *v.*) *distinguished the several Offices*, &c. *that were then most Observable in the Apostolick Church. I suppose that the helping such as were ready to fall, did most properly belong to the Spiritual Governours.* This is above-answered: and it is not one whit stronger by being said over again. Further, he Asserteth, but hath not shewed us, how the Context leadeth to this Interpretation: his supposing it to be most proper to the several guids to help them that fall, doth not prove his design; unless he could shew that there was an Officer in the Church who had his Designation from thus *helping* People: and when he hath done that, he must shew that this is peculiar to the Bishop, and that no other Church Officer is called Ἀντιλήψεις from *helping* them who are ready to fall. That *Grotius* telleth us that *the Antient Greeks interpreted the Word*, προστασίαι is a wronging of *Grotius*; who saith not *Græci veteres*, but *Græci complures*: and it is nothing to his purpose: for *Grotius* saying it doth not prove it: neither

neither doth *Grotius* cite any of the *Græci complures*. *Suiceri theſaurus Eccleſiæ* I can not get at preſent: but if he ſay what our Author alledges, his ſole Authority muſt not carry it againſt all others, who have written Lexicons. *Hamond*, on the Place, Expoundeth it of Biſhops; not on Account of their προεδρία, or Governing Power, but becauſe they had the Care of the Poor, and the Diſpenſing of the Goods of the Church, as I ſhewed in the Place above Cited of this Book. Which, if it were granted, would make nothing for Epiſcopal Juriſdiction. We maintain that the *Deacons* are here meant, and if the Biſhops be *Deacons*, let them have this Place in the Liſt of Church Officers. For they had no Room in it before, nor on the Score of Juriſdiction over other Church Officers. I do not derogate from *Grotius his Knowledge of the Signification of Words*, nor of *his Ability to have Written a Lexicon*: but I do not look on him as beyond a Poſſibility of Miſtake, even in that wherein he excelled. And indeed he ſpeaketh very doubtfully of this Matter, as his Words Cited by my Antagoniſt do ſhew: nor doth he poſitively ſay, that the Biſhops are meant by this Word. Another Proof of the Signification of the Word, is from *Pſ.* 48. 3. where *the ſeventy uſe it to ſignifie the Lords helping his People*: what is this to the Purpoſe? the Queſtion is not whether this Word have the Notion of Help; but whether it have the Notion of Government: but our Author Mendeth the Matter, making up, by his Latine Tranſlation, what is not in the Greek; for he ſaith ὅταν ἀντιλαμβάνηται αὐτῶν *muſt ſignifie, cum ſuſcipiet eam, nempe Civitatem, in Tutelam*: why muſt it ſignifie this: why may it not as well be turned, *cum opitulabitur illi*? *Chryſoſt.* hath it, εἰς ἐχύρωμα, *ad Munitionem. Aquila* εἰς ὑπερύψωσιν, *ad Exaltationem.* None of all theſe ſignifie any thing of Government; but of Defence or Support: ſo that nothing in this Word agreeth half ſo well to the Biſhops, as to the *Deacons* Work. I hope he will not think, that becauſe the Lord who is in this Pſalm, ſaid to Help His People, doth alſo Rule them, that it hence followeth, that every Ἀντιλήπτωρ is alſo a Ruler. The ſame Import hath what he Citeth out of *Æmilius Portus*, who from *Suidas* Tranſlateth Ἀντιλήπτωρ *Propugnator, Defenſor, Auxiliator.* For none of theſe Words import Government, all that they ſignifie, may be applyed better to the Deacon, than to the Biſhop. I hope I have (with the Current of Expoſitors) offered a better Expoſition of the Word we Debate about, than *Grotius* hath Choſen: and yet ſhall readily Comply with my Authors Advice, in *being far from Comparing my ſelf with that great Man.*

§ 24. What

What he further saith of that Exposition of *Jerom, Quid facit Episcopus, &c.* he hath often Repeated, and it hath been as often Answered: to which he had said something, if he had shewed the Consistency of what I said could not agree: but this he thinketh not fit to Attempt: only Entreats me to give a Paraphrase and Commentary on the Conclusion of that very Epistle of *Jerom* to *Euagrius*, in which (saith he) *Jerom affirmeth, that the Hierarchy of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon, was Founded on Apostolick Tradition: and that they Hold the same Place in the Christian Church: which the High Priest, Priests and Levites had in the Temple.* For Satisfaction to this his Demand, I refer him to *Sect.* 6. S. 9, 10. where what he Desireth is already Performed: and it is shewed that *Jerom* meant no such thing as he alledgeth. The hundred Things in my Book that he will not medle with, and which he is pleased to call *Trifling Stories, or Personal Reflections*, must stand as they are: let the Reader judge of what I have there said, and of his Censure of it. And yet he spendeth some Pages on a Story, that he and I had formerly Debated, which is of least Moment of any of them: his Reason I shall not Enquire into: nor do I intend to be any further Concerned in Jangle about Stories so variously told us, as that is; and which may be many Ways Disguised: no part of which I was Witness to, nor know any thing of, but by Information. For the Personal Reflections he chargeth me with, he mentioneth but two; I leave it to the Reader, who shall think fit to Compare the two Books, to Consider, whether any thing is said of him, but what to be Literally true, himself had given Ground to think: and they are Matters of Fact, and of no great Moment, save that they may derogate from the Strength of what he Writeth. And let all Men of Candor and Understanding Witness between him and me, whether in his Book now under Consideration, and in his former *Apology*, there be not many for one of mine, of not only Personal Reflections on his Antagonist, but Reflections on the whole Party, without Distinction or Exception: and that by Imputing to them the Worst of Evils; and Treating them with the most Insolent Contempt that Words can express; as I have here and there observed, *ὡς ἐν παιδιᾷ*: and the Reader may find presently after this his Complaint, *viz.* 332, 333, 334. The *Authority that the Presbyterians had over the Church of Scotland, and consequently, over the Episcopal Clergy*, I had Debated with him before. I need say no more, till he Answer what hath been already Discoursed on that Head. What he saith, *p.* 332. of his Resolution *not to continue this Debate, if not managed by greater Candor and Civility*, I do much approve: if he will put that Condition on himself too. If he, or any else, Write in his Strain: yea, if they bring not somewhat that is not yet Answered, and is of Weight. I think our Side will not Trouble them with more Arguings on this Head of Government: there is enough said, if Men will Listen to Argument; if they will not, what is said, is too much. For my Part, I am weary of such Altercations; and shall not be easily drawn into this Paper War any more: tho I am Resolved, by the Help of God, never to Abandon the right Way of God, nor to withdraw my Poor Help from the Truth and Ordinances of Christ, when it shall be needed; and I shall be in any Capacity to afford it.

FINIS.